

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, October 22, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SKELTON].

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 21, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable IKE SKELTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on Friday, October 22, 1993.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

May the beauty of the day, the majesty of Your mighty acts, and the esteem of people united in mutual respect, remind us, O gracious God, of Your bountiful creation and the opportunities of this new day. May our lives and deeds rise above the ordinary level of give and take and through faithfulness and trust in You, may we be the people You would have us be. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. HINCHEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to approve the extension of nondiscriminatory treat-

ment with respect to the products of Romania.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3116. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2403), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 3116) "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SASSER, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, and Mr. HATFIELD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2750) "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 29, 33, 35, 36, 45, 46, 47, 53, 54, 60, 70, 73, 74, 88, 92, 93, 106, 124, 125, 127, 128, 133, 134, 140, 142, 143, 150, 158, 159, 163, 175, 176, 177, 180, 182, 185, and 186, to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2491) "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 38 and 113, to the above-entitled bill.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 22, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Thursday October 21, 1993 at 9:09 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment: H.J. Res. 281.

With great respect, I am  
Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled joint resolution on Thursday, October 21, 1993: House Joint Resolution 281, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. BEVILL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-305)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2445) "making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free further conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 24, 27, 35, and 47.

That the House recede from its amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26, 34, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 46 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,688,990,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$13,819,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following: *which 18 are for replacement only*, \$3,223,910,000 to remain available until expended; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,595,198,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,181,855,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$16,560,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, and 39.

TOM BEVILL,  
VIC FAZIO,  
JIM CHAPMAN,  
DOUGLAS "PETE"  
PETERSON,  
ED PASTOR,  
CARRIE MEEK,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
JOHN T. MYERS,  
DEAN A. GALLO,  
HAROLD ROGERS,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
FRITZ HOLLINGS,  
JIM SASSER,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
HARRY REID,  
BOB KERREY,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
THAD COCHRAN,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
DON NICKLES,

SLADE GORTON,  
MITCH MCCONNELL,  
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 103-135 and Senate Report 103-147 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate or the conference, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases in which the House or Senate have directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

#### TITLE I

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$207,540,000 for General Investigations as proposed by the House instead of \$208,544,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note that the San Joaquin River Basin, South Sacramento County Streams, California, study will include an examination of the water resources problems that were to be addressed by the Northern California Streams, Morrison Stream Group, California, study proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes \$150,000 for the Newport Bay Harbor, California, project as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to utilize those funds to initiate feasibility phase studies for the project as authorized by section 841 of Public Law 99-662. Environmental preservation benefits associated with the authorization to modify the existing Federal project at Newport Bay Harbor by extending channels into the upper Newport Bay shall be consolidated with other benefits to be derived from the project and be fully evaluated.

The conferees note that the limitation on the San Joaquin River, Pine Flat Dam, Fish and Wildlife Restoration, California, study described in House Report 102-555 relative to involuntary acquisition of water rights, storage rights and land is not intended to apply to investigations of the enlargement of Pine Flat Reservoir or the construction of off-stream reservoirs, which are to be included in the study.

The conferees have provided \$500,000 for a reconnaissance study to investigate the feasibility of flood control and other water resource improvements for the City of Winters, California, near Dry Creek, Chickahominy Slough and Moody Slough.

The conferees have provided \$600,000 for the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to prepare a reconnaissance study and transmit to Congress a report addressing solutions for facilitating fish migration on the Sacramento River, California. The investigation shall emphasize the potential for modifying the existing Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and ship lock for use as a supplemental route for anadromous fish migration. The Delta channel could potentially provide a migration route for anadromous fish which would bypass Delta channels and agricultural diversions east of Rio Vista.

The conference agreement includes \$800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct flood control studies for St. Louis City and County, Jefferson and Ste. Genevieve Counties, Missouri. The conferees expect the Corps, in conducting this regional flood control study, to work closely with local communities. At the request of the communities, the Corps should consider both structural solutions and nonstructural alternatives (such as the relocation of individuals and businesses).

The conference agreement includes \$2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct studies of the reaches of the upper Mississippi and lower Missouri Rivers and their tributaries that were flooded in 1993. From within those funds, the conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to initiate preliminary activities on a study to assess the adequacy of current flood control measures on the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries. The study should focus on identifying public facilities, industrial, petrochemical, hazardous waste and other facilities which require additional flood protection, assess the adequacy of current flood control measures, examine the differences in Federal cost-sharing for construction and maintenance of flood control projects on the upper and lower Mississippi River system, evaluate the cost-effectiveness of alternative flood control projects, and recommend improvements to the current flood control system.

The conferees recognize the need to undergo a feasibility study of erosion control in order to protect the historic Montauk Point Lighthouse located on Long Island, New York. Therefore, the conferees encourage the Army Corps of Engineers to implement a feasibility study in fiscal year 1994 should the Corps identify the necessary funds from its accounts that are both available and unexpended during fiscal year 1994.

Within the amount provided for Research and Development, the conference agreement includes \$2,000,000, \$800,000 above the budget request, for activities related to zebra mussel control.

The conferees have provided \$600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a watershed management study of the Cypress Valley Watershed, Texas, in close coordination with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. This study is to be conducted under the authority of the resolution of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation for the Cypress Bayou Basin.

The conference agreement includes \$1,000,000 for Corps of Engineers flood data collection activities instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$300,000 for the initiation of a construction technology transfer project between the Corps of



Engineers construction-related research activities and Indiana State University as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

Central Basin Groundwater Project, California, \$750,000;

Los Angeles County Water Conservation, California, \$100,000;

Los Angeles River Watercourse Improvement, California, \$300,000;

Norco Bluffs, California, \$150,000;

Rancho Palos Verdes, California, \$80,000;

Biscayne Bay, Florida, \$700,000;

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, \$200,000;

Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, \$310,000;

Ohio River Shoreline Flood Protection, Indiana, \$400,000;

Hazard, Kentucky, \$250,000;

Brockton, Massachusetts, \$350,000;

Passaic River Mainstem, New Jersey, \$17,000,000;

Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania, \$400,000;

Juniata River Basin, Pennsylvania, \$450,000;

Lackawanna River Basin Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania, \$300,000;

Jennings Randolph Lake, West Virginia, \$400,000;

Monongahela River Comprehensive, West Virginia, \$600,000; and

West Virginia Comprehensive, West Virginia \$500,000;

Provided, That notwithstanding ongoing studies using previously appropriated funds, and using \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to conduct hydraulic modeling, foundations analysis and related design, and mapping efforts in continuing preconstruction engineering and design for the additional lock at the Kentucky Dam, Kentucky, project, in accordance with the Kentucky Lock Addition Feasibility Report approved by Report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 1, 1992: Provided further, That using \$250,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to include the study of the Alafia River as part of the Tampa Harbor, Alafia River and Big Bend, Florida, feasibility study: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$250,000 of available funds to complete a detailed project report, and plans and specifications for a permanent shore erosion protection project at Geneva State Park, Ashtabula County, Ohio: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$400,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue preconstruction engineering and design, including preparation of the special design report, initiation of National Environmental Policy Act document preparation, and initiation of hydraulic model studies for the Kaunapau Harbor navigation study, Lanai, Hawaii: Provided further, That using \$4,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to proceed with detailed designs and plans and specifications, including detailed cost estimates, for the master plan of the Indianapolis, White River, Central Waterfront, Indiana, project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to limit the Columbia River Navigation Channel, Oregon and Washington, feasibility study to the investigation of the feasibility of constructing a navigation channel not

to exceed 43 feet in depth from the Columbia River entrance to the Port of Portland/Port of Vancouver and to modify the initial Project Management Plan accordingly: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$400,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate a reconnaissance study, including economic and environmental studies, for the Pocatigo River and Swamp, South Carolina, project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$90,000 of the funds appropriated herein to complete the reconnaissance study of the Black Fox and Oakland Spring wetland area in Murfreesboro, Tennessee: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$200,000 of available funds to initiate the planning and design of remedial measures to restore the environmental integrity and recreational boating facilities at Old Hickory, Tennessee, in the vicinity of Drakes Creek Park, in accordance with the reconnaissance study findings dated September 1993: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$4,460,000 available funds to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, flood control project authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 stat. 4118) so that the project will be ready for construction by October 1, 1994: Provided further, That all plans, specifications and design documents shall be concurrently reviewed in order to expedite the project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to undertake preconstruction engineering and design of the Virginia Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection, Virginia, project, including storm water collection and discharge, as authorized by section 102(cc) of Public Law 102-580

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes provisions contained in both the House- and Senate-passed bills for the following projects: Central Basin Groundwater, California; Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana; Ohio River Shoreline Flood Protection, Indiana; Hazard, Kentucky; Brockton, Massachusetts; Jennings Randolph Lake, West Virginia; Monongahela River Comprehensive, West Virginia; and West Virginia Comprehensive, West Virginia.

The conference agreement restores provisions included by the House and stricken by the Senate for the following projects: Los Angeles County Water Conservation, California; Los Angeles River Watercourse Improvement, California; Norco Bluffs, California; Rancho Palos Verdes, California; Biscayne Bay, Florida; Lake George, Hobart, Indiana; Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania; Juniata River Basin, Pennsylvania; and Lackawanna River Basin Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania.

The conference agreement restores funding levels proposed by the House and amended by the Senate for the following projects: Tampa Harbor, Alafia River and Big Bend, Florida; Indianapolis, White River, Central Waterfront, Indiana; and Passaic River Mainstem, New Jersey. The conference agreement also includes additional directive language for the Tampa Harbor, Alafia River and Big Bend, Florida, and the Indianapolis, White River, Central Waterfront, Indiana, projects.

The conference agreement deletes a provision proposed by the Senate for the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois, project.

The conference agreement includes provisions proposed by the Senate for the following projects: Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky; Geneva State Park, Ohio; Kaunapau Harbor, Hawaii; Columbia River Navigation Channel, Oregon; Pocatigo River and Swamp, South Carolina; Black Fox and Oakland Spring Wetland, Tennessee; Old Hickory Lake, Tennessee; Ste. Genevieve, Missouri; and Virginia Beach, Virginia. The conference agreement provides \$2,000,000 for the Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky, project instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$1,255,875,000.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$1,255,875,000 for Construction, General, excluding the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project, instead of \$1,296,167,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House had proposed a total of \$1,389,138,000 for Construction, General, including the Red River Waterway project. Including the Red River Waterway project, the conference agreement appropriates a total of \$1,400,875,000 for Construction, General.

While not including construction funding for the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas, project, the conferees express support for the project and urge the Corps of Engineers to continue to expedite the engineering and design so that construction can begin as soon as a favorable recommendation is reached by the executive branch, preferably for the fiscal year 1995 budget cycle. At that time, the Committee stands ready to consider a budget proposal.

Within available funds, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to implement the hillside erosion component included in the Swan Lake Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Illinois, project, which is an important feature of the Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.

The conference agreement includes an additional \$100,000 for the Winfield Locks and Dam, West Virginia, project for technical assistance to communities around the project site to help those communities understand and analyze the remedial options for the toxic and hazardous materials on the site as authorized by section 347 of Public Law 102-580 as proposed by the House and the Senate. The conferees require that any consultant contracted with to provide analysis of the remedial options be totally independent of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Within the Corps of Engineers, Continuing Authorities Programs, the conferees direct the Corps to undertake the projects described in the House and Senate reports. For the Northport, Alabama, project, the conference agreement includes \$1,050,000 for design and construction of the project as proposed by the House. In addition, under the Section 205 program, the conference agreement includes \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Feather Creek flood control project in Clinton, Indiana.

The conference agreement includes \$11,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers Aquatic Plant Control Program as proposed by the

House. The conferees direct that the additional funds provided above the budget request be utilized as described in the House report.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

Rillito River, Arizona, \$4,200,000;  
Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California, \$4,000,000;

Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California, \$400,000;

San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, \$12,000,000;

Sonoma Baylands Wetland Demonstration Project, California, \$4,000,000;

Central and Southern Florida, Florida, \$17,850,000;

Kissimmee River, Florida, \$5,000,000;

Melaleuca Quarantine Facility, Florida, \$1,000,000;

Casino Beach, Illinois, \$820,000;

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois, \$13,000,000;

O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois, \$5,000,000;

Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa, \$2,700,000;

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Jefferson Parish), Louisiana, \$200,000;

Anacostia River, Maryland and District of Columbia, \$7,000,000;

Clinton River Spillway, Michigan, \$2,000,000;

Silver Bay Harbor, Minnesota, \$2,600,000;

Stillwater, Minnesota, \$2,400,000;

Sowashee Creek, Mississippi, \$3,240,000;

Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey, \$1,000,000;

New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, New York and New Jersey, \$3,900,000;

Rochester Harbor, New York, \$4,000,000;

Wilmington Harbor Ocean Bar, North Carolina, \$5,266,000;

West Columbus, Ohio, \$9,000,000;

Lackawanna River Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania, \$2,000,000;

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, Pennsylvania, \$10,000,000;

Quonset Point-Davisville, Rhode Island (for 2 elevated water storage towers and the relocation of sewer lines), \$1,875,000;

Lake O' The Pines-Big Cypress Bayou, Texas, \$300,000;

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, \$4,000,000;

Wallisville Lake, Texas, \$1,000,000;

Richmond Filtration Plant, Virginia, \$1,000,000;

Southern West Virginia Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, West Virginia, \$3,500,000; and

State Road and Ebner Coulees, LaCrosse and Shelby, Wisconsin, \$1,467,000; Provided, That

the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$3,500,000

of available funds to initiate and complete construction of the Finn Revetment portion of the

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana, project: Provided further, That

the Chief of Engineers is directed to use a fully funded contract for the construction of the

Finn Revetment: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief

of Engineers, is directed to use \$3,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue the

Red River Levees and Bank Stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, project, including the

completion of studies to improve the stability of

the levee system from Index, Arkansas, to the Louisiana state line and the continuation of rehabilitation work underway: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to expend \$500,000 in fiscal year 1994 to initiate reconstruction of the Sacramento River floodwall between miles 58 and 60 of the Sacramento River, California, as an essential portion of the Sacramento Urban Levee Reconstruction project pursuant to the Sacramento River Flood Control Act of 1917, as amended, and the Local Cooperation Agreement signed on June 4, 1990: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall (1) use \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to carry out engineering and design for the relocation of the comfort and lifeguard stations on the Atlantic Coast of New York City from Rockaway Inlet to Norton Point, New York, project as authorized by section 1076 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 2015), and (2) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, report to Congress on the results of the expenditure of funds required under paragraph (1): Provided further, That with \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Bethel, Alaska, project authorized by Public Law 99-662, including but not limited to initiating lands and damages, erosion control construction, and continued related engineering and construction management: Provided further, That no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to the construction of the Bethel, Alaska, project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$24,119,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana, Hurricane Protection project, including continued construction of parallel protection along the Orleans and London Avenue Outfall Canals and the award of continuing contracts for construction of this parallel protection under the same terms and conditions specified for such work under this heading in Public Law 102-377: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$450,000 of the funds appropriated herein to complete the repair and restoration to a safe condition of the existing Tulsa and West Tulsa local protection project, Oklahoma, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1941, Public Law 73-228: Provided further, That with \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate construction of the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367, with initial efforts concentrated in the communities of Buskirk and McCarr, in accordance with the Huntington District Commander's preliminary draft detailed project report for Pike County, Kentucky, dated March 1993, using continuing contracts: Provided further, That with \$700,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate construction, using continuing contracts, of the Williamsburg, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367, in accordance with Plan B of the approved draft specific project report for Williamsburg, Kentucky, dated April 1993: Provided further, That with \$19,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Sec-

retary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue to undertake structural and nonstructural work associated with the Barbourville, Kentucky, and the Harlan, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367, and is further directed to design and construct a system to collect and transport sewage from the unincorporated community of Rio Vista to the Harlan, Kentucky, treatment plant, as part of the Harlan, Kentucky, element: Provided further, That with \$5,365,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue to undertake structural and nonstructural work associated with the Matewan, West Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367: Provided further, That with \$3,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367 using continuing contracts: Provided further, That no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to construction of the Matewan, West Virginia, Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia, Barbourville, Kentucky, and Harlan, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project: Provided further, That with \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction, using continuing contracts, of the Salyersville, Kentucky, cut-through channels project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate and complete construction of offshore breakwaters at Grand Isle, Louisiana, as an integral part of the repair of features of the Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, project damaged by Hurricane Andrew using funds previously appropriated for that purpose in the fiscal year 1992 Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, Public Law 102-368, which are available for this work: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the section 14 bank stabilization program at McGregor Park in Clarksville, Tennessee, utilizing heretofore appropriated funds until the Federal funds limit of \$500,000 is reached or bank protection for the entire park is completed: Provided further, That using \$6,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue with the authorized Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana, project in an orderly but expeditious manner and within this amount, \$3,800,000 shall be used to continue rehabilitation or replacement of all deteriorated drainage structures which threaten the security of this critical protection, and \$2,500,000 shall be used to repair the river bank at Columbia, Louisiana, which is eroding and placing the project levee protecting the city in imminent danger of failure: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$3,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to provide design and construction assistance for a water transmission line from the northern part of Beaver Lake, Arkansas, into Benton and Washington Counties, Arkansas, as authorized by section 220 of Public Law 102-580; and in addition, \$145,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated for construction



of the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project, as authorized by laws, and the Secretary of the Army is directed to continue the second phase of construction of Locks and Dams 4 and 5; complete construction of Howard Capout, McDade, Elm Grove, Cecile, Curtis, Sunny Point, and Eagle Bend Phase I and Phase II revetments in Pools 4 and 5, and levee modifications in Pool 5, all of which were previously directed to be initiated; and award continuing contracts in fiscal year 1994 for construction of the following features of the Red River Waterway which are not to be considered fully funded: recreation facilities in Pools 4 and 5, Piermont/Nicholas and Sunny Point Capouts, Lock and Dam 4 Upstream Dikes, Lock and Dam 5 Downstream Additional Control Structure, Wells Island Road Revetment, and construction dredging in Pool 4; all as authorized by laws, and the Secretary is further directed to provide annual reimbursement to the project's local sponsor for the Federal share of management costs for the Bayou Bodcau Mitigation Area as authorized by Public Law 101-640, the Water Resources Development Act of 1990.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes provisions contained in both the House- and Senate-passed bills for the following projects: Rillito River, Arizona; Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California; Sacramento River Flood Control (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California; San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California; Sonoma Baylands Wetland Demonstration, California; Kissimmee River, Florida; O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois; Pike County, Kentucky; Salyersville, Kentucky; Williamsburg, Kentucky; Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Jefferson Parish), Louisiana; Anacostia River, Maryland and District of Columbia; Stillwater, Minnesota; Sowash Creek, Mississippi; Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey; Lake O' The Pines-Big Cypress Bayou, Texas; Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma; Wallisville Lake, Texas; and Southern West Virginia Environmental Restoration and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, West Virginia. The provisions for the Pike County, Kentucky, Salyersville, Kentucky, and Williamsburg, Kentucky, projects have been amended to provide additional directive language to the Secretary of the Army.

The conference agreement restores provisions included by the House and stricken by the Senate for the following projects: Melaleuca Quarantine Facility, Florida; McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois; Clinton River Spillway, Michigan; Silver Bay Harbor, Minnesota; Rochester Harbor, New York; Wilmington Harbor Ocean Bar, North Carolina; Lackawanna River Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania; South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, Pennsylvania; Richmond Filtration Plant, Virginia; and State Road and Ebner Coulees, LaCrosse and Shelby, Wisconsin.

The conference agreement provides \$17,850,000 for the Central and Southern Florida, Florida, project as proposed by the House instead of \$9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; provides \$820,000 for the Casino Beach, Illinois, project as proposed by the House instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate; provides \$2,700,000 for the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa, project as proposed by the House instead of \$1,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provides \$3,900,000 for the New York Harbor Col-

lection and Removal of Drift, New York and New Jersey, project as proposed by the House instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement amends House language for the Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas, project; the Barbourville, Kentucky, project; the Harlan, Kentucky, project; and the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, project as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement also provides additional directive language for the Harlan, Kentucky, project.

The conference agreement restores House language stricken by the Senate for the West Columbus, Ohio, project amended to provide \$9,000,000 for the project instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement deletes a House provision regarding the Fort Point, Galveston, Texas, project as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes provisions proposed by the Senate for the following projects: Quonset Point-Davisville, Rhode Island; Red River Levees and Bank Stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas; Atlantic Coast of New York, New York; Bethel, Alaska; Tulsa and West Tulsa, Oklahoma; Matewan, West Virginia; Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia; Grand Isle, Louisiana; McGregor Park, Clarksville, Tennessee; Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana; and Beaver Lake, Arkansas. The provisions regarding the McGregor Park project has been amended to make a technical correction.

The conference agreement appropriates \$145,000,000 for the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project as proposed by the Senate. The House had included \$65,000,000 for the project within the amount appropriated in Amendment No. 3.

The conferees adopt the House report language on the Kissimmee River, Florida, project and add the following. The Corps of Engineers is directed to sign a single Project Cooperation Agreement with the South Florida Water Management District as authorized by section 46 of Public Law 100-676 and section 101(8) of Public Law 102-580 no later than February 1, 1994, in accordance with the Memorandum to the South Atlantic Division Commander dated February 17, 1993, and signed by the Jacksonville Deputy District Engineer for Project Management.

The conferees agree with the language in the Senate report regarding the Beaver Lake, Arkansas, water transmission line project authorized by section 220 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

The conferees agree with the language in the Senate report regarding the West Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, project.

The conferees agree with the language in the House report regarding the Red River Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, project and note that the features to be developed include Areas VI, VII, IX, XIII, XIV, and Crowell Brine Lake.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$348,875,000 for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$352,475,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agree with the language contained in the House report regarding the Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Demonstration Erosion Control Program and the Wickliffe Bluff, Kentucky, project.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$1,688,990,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General instead of \$1,691,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,673,704,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes a total of \$1,869,000 for the Chena River Lakes, Alaska, project. The amount provided includes \$200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to investigate possible solutions to groundwater flooding that is occurring downstream of Moose Creek Dam and \$250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to mitigate fishery impacts. The Senate had proposed that the study of flooding problems be performed under the General Investigations account.

The conferees note that the rock rubble mound entrance jetties at Newport Bay Harbor, California, may require structural rehabilitation work and ask that the Corps of Engineers survey the need and report back to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for consideration in fiscal year 1995.

Within available funds, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to continue studying alternatives for whitewater releases at the John W. Flannagan Dam, Virginia.

The conferees agree with the language contained in the Senate report for the St. Georges Bridge, Delaware, project.

Amendment No. 7: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that provides \$400,000 for the Los Angeles River (Sepulveda Basin to Arroyo Seco), California, project.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes the word "and" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that provides \$2,500,000 for the Flint River Flood Control, Michigan, project.

Amendment No. 10: Restores "and" proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that provides \$250,000 for the New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, project.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that provides \$5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake critical maintenance work on the Kentucky River, Kentucky, Locks and Dams 5-14 and directs the Corps to transfer those facilities to the Commonwealth of Kentucky; directs the Secretary of the Army to maintain a minimum conservation pool level of 475.5 feet at Wister Lake, Oklahoma; and directs the Secretary of the Army to complete long-term dredged material disposal plans for the existing Columbia River navigation project, including associated fish and wildlife studies.

#### GENERAL EXPENSES

Amendment No. 13: Restores House language stricken by the Senate which provides that not to exceed \$54,855,000 of the funds provided in the Act shall be available for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and deletes language proposed by the Senate which provided that not to exceed \$58,255,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief of Engineers unless the Secretary of the Army determines that additional funds are required and notified the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate of the reasons therefore.

The conferees agree with the language in the House report regarding billbacks and project management.

GENERAL PROVISIONS  
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers of the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that in fiscal year 1994, the Secretary of the Army shall advertise for competitive bid at least 7,500,000 cubic yards of the hopper dredge volume accomplished with Government-owned dredges in fiscal year 1992 and which, notwithstanding the provisions of the section, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to use the Corps of Engineers dredge fleet to undertake projects under certain conditions. The conferees view the 7,500,000 cubic yards as a target, not a floor, and expect contract awards to reflect this.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which will permit the Corps of Engineers to reprogram funds to continue the construction of projects in order to prevent the termination of contracts or the delay of scheduled work.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes language proposed by the Senate regarding the removal or demolition of residential structures in the Muskingum River Basin, Ohio.

The conferees have agreed not to include bill language proposed by the Senate regarding the removal or demolition of residential structures in the Muskingum River Basin, Ohio. However, the conferees urge the Corps of Engineers not to remove or demolish any residential structure that is subject to an easement or right-of-way in favor of the United States for the containment or impoundment of waters in the Muskingum River Basin, Ohio, until such time as the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives have had the opportunity to review and address the policy in the next Water Resources Development authorization legislation.

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers of the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 108. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the City of Galveston, Texas, fee simple absolute title to a parcel of land containing approximately 605 acres known as the San Jacinto Disposal Area located on the east end of Galveston Island, Texas, in the W.A.A. Wallace Survey, A-647 and A-648, City of Galveston, Galveston County, Texas, being part of the old Fort San Jacinto site, at the fair market value of such parcel to be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d). Such conveyance shall only be made by the Secretary of the Army upon the agreement of the Secretary and the City as to all compensation due herein.

(b) COMPENSATION FOR CONVEYANCE.—Upon receipt of compensation from the City of Galveston, The Secretary shall convey the parcel as described in subsection (a). Such compensation shall include—

(1) conveyance to the Department of the Army of fee simple absolute title to a parcel of land containing approximately 564 acres on Pelican Island, Texas, in the Eneas Smith Survey, A-190, Pelican Island, City of Galveston, Galveston County, Texas, adjacent to property currently owned by the United States. The fair

market value of such parcel will be determined in accordance with the provision of subsection (d); and

(2) payment to the United States of an amount equal to the difference of the fair market value of the parcel to be conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) and the fair market value of the parcel to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(c) DISPOSITION OF SPOIL.—Costs of maintaining the Galveston Harbor and Channel will continue to be governed by the Local Cooperation Agreement (LCA) between the United States of America and the City of Galveston dated October 18, 1973, as amended. Upon conveyance of the parcel described in subsection (a), the Department of the Army shall be compensated directly for the present value of the total costs to the Department for disposal of dredge material and site preparation pursuant to the LCA, in excess of the present value of the total costs that would have been incurred if this conveyance had not been made.

(d) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the land to be conveyed pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be determined by independent appraisers using the market value method.

(e) NAVIGATIONAL SERVITUDE.—

(1) DECLARATION OF NONNAVIGABILITY; PUBLIC INTEREST.—Unless the Secretary finds, after consultation with local and regional public officials (including local and regional public planning organizations), that the proposed subject to be undertaken within the parcel described in subsection (a) are not in the public interest then, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), such parcel is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States.

(2) LIMITS ON APPLICABILITY; REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—The declaration under paragraph (a) shall apply only to those parts of the parcel described in subsection (a) which are or will be bulkheaded or filled or otherwise occupied by permanent structures, including marina facilities. All such work is subject to all applicable Federal statutes and regulations including, but not limited to, sections 9 and 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 U.S.C. 401 and 403), commonly known as the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1899, section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(3) EXPIRATION DATE.—If, 20 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, any area or part thereof described in subsection (a) is not bulkheaded or filled or occupied by permanent structures, including marina facilities, in accordance with the requirements set out in paragraph (2), or if work in connection with any activity permitted in paragraph (2) is not commenced within 5 years after issuance of such permits, then the declaration of nonnavigability for such area or part thereof shall expire.

(f) SURVEY AND STUDY.—The 605-acre parcel and the 564-acre parcel shall be surveyed and further legally described prior to conveyance. Not later than 60 days following enactment of this Act, if he deems it necessary, the Secretary of the Army shall complete a review of the applicability of section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to the said parcels.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees have included a provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the City of Galveston, Texas, a 605-acre parcel of land known as the San Jacinto Disposal Area in exchange for a 564-acre parcel of land on Pelican Island, Texas, known as the Pelican Island Alternative Disposal site together with payment to the United States of an amount

equal to the difference in the agreed upon fair market values of the two parcels of land plus the present value of certain increased costs directly attributable to this transaction. The Senate provision has been amended to make technical corrections. The conveyances shall occur upon agreement by the Secretary and the City with respect to all compensation due under the provisions of this amendment.

The San Jacinto Disposal Area is currently used by the Army Corps of Engineers for the disposal of spoils dredged from the channels leading into Galveston Bay. The Pelican Island site, however, offers the Corps an alternate site for future spoils deposit that will serve as a viable spoils site substantially longer than would the San Jacinto site.

The fair market value of the parcels to be conveyed shall be determined by three independent appraisers, each a member in good standing of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, using the market value method. One appraiser each shall be selected by the Corps and the City of Galveston, and one appraiser shall be selected by mutual agreement of the two parties.

If the fair market values as determined by the three appraisers are not the same and the difference between the high and low values is ten percent or less, the three values shall be averaged to determine fair market value. If the high and low values differ by more than ten percent, the appraisers shall attempt to agree upon a fair market value. If the three fail to agree, the three appraisers shall jointly select a fourth appraiser who shall independently appraise each tract. The highest and lowest of the four appraisals shall be discarded and the two remaining appraisals averaged to determine fair market value.

Costs of maintaining the Galveston Harbor and Channel will continue to be governed by the Local Cooperation Agreement between the United States of America and the City of Galveston dated October 18, 1973, as amended. This provision also provides that the Department of the Army shall be compensated for the present value of costs to the Department that will be incurred under the Local Cooperation Agreement which exceed the present value of costs that would have been incurred had this transaction not occurred. The provisions of the amendment extinguish any rights of the United States of navigational servitude over the San Jacinto Disposal Area.

Wetlands created in a disposal area by the Department of the Army through active spoil operations are "non-jurisdictional". Accordingly, any wetlands on the San Jacinto Disposal Area require no mitigation.

The conferees understand that wetlands on the 564-acre Pelican Island parcel were also created by the Department of the Army during spoilage operations. This parcel was spoiled upon and navigational servitude rights claimed until removed by the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1991. The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
ALABAMA					
(N)	CHICKASAW CREEK, AL.....	253,000	---	253,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN HUNTSVILLE - MADISON COUNTY, AL.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
	MUSCLE SHOALS, AL.....	---	---	300,000	---
ALASKA					
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK.....	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	CHENA RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, AK.....	122,000	---	122,000	---
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK.....	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	COOK INLET, AK.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RDP)	KAKE HARBOR, AK.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	NORTHERN SEA COMMERCIAL ROUTE STUDY, AR.....	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD AREA RIVERS, AK.....	188,000	---	188,000	---
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD, LOWELL CREEK, AK.....	142,000	---	142,000	---
(N)	ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK.....	---	---	125,000	---
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS AND DRY STRAITS, AK.....	170,000	---	170,000	---
ARIZONA					
	COMBINED ARIZONA RECONNAISSANCE STUDY, AZ.....	---	---	280,000	---
	GILA RIVER, GILLESPIE DAM TO YUMA, AZ.....	---	---	1,000,000	---
	GILA RIVER AND TRIBS, LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	HASSAYAMPA RIVER AT WICKENBURG, AZ.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	RIO SALADO AREA, TEMPE AZ.....	---	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ.....	450,000	---	450,000	---
ARKANSAS					
	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR.....	---	---	475,000	---
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER WETLANDS AND FLOOD CONTROL, AR.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, HOT SPRINGS, AR.....	650,000	---	650,000	---
(SPE)	WHITE RIVER WETLANDS, AR & MO.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA.....	---	2,000,000	---	4,000,000
	CALLEGUAS CREEK, CA.....	---	---	130,000	---
(FC)	CARNEROS CREEK, CA.....	---	600,000	---	600,000
	CENTRAL BASIN GROUNDWATER PROJ, WHITTIER NARROWS, CA..	---	---	750,000	---
	CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, ORANGE COUNTY, CA.....	---	---	275,000	---
	CITY OF WINTERS, CA.....	---	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	COAST OF CA, SOUTH COAST REGION (ORANGE COUNTY).....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA.....	162,000	---	162,000	---
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA.....	---	500,000	---	500,000

October 22, 1993

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

25909

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	LACDA WATER CONSERVATION, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	LEONARD RANCH, CA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA.....	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	---	3,633,000	---	3,633,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, CA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.....	---	79,000	---	79,000
(SP)	MALIBU COASTAL AREA, CA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA.....	280,000	---	280,000	---
	MARINA DEL RAY, CA.....	---	---	175,000	---
(SP)	MISSION BAY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MISSION ZANJA CREEK, CA.....	341,000	---	341,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	---	122,000	---	122,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, SANTA ANA RIVER, CA.....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK BASIN (LAKE CO), CA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, UPR SACRAMENTO R, F&WL HABITAT RESTORATI	250,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, WESTSIDE TRIBUTARIES TO YOLO BYPASS, CA.	350,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA.....	---	700,000	---	900,000
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA.....	---	550,000	---	550,000
(SP)	OCEANSIDE SHORELINE, CA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(SP)	PACIFIC COAST SHORELINE, CARLSBAD, CA.....	260,000	---	260,000	---
(FDP)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA.....	197,000	---	197,000	---
(N)	POINT ARENA (BREAKWATER), CA.....	245,000	---	245,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA.....	---	---	80,000	---
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FISH MIGRATION.....	---	---	600,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA.....	900,000	---	900,000	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA.....	215,000	---	215,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO CO),..	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP,..	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FIREBAUGH AND MENDOTA, CA....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SAN JOAQUIN R MAIN STEM & TRI	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STRMS	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA.....	---	100,000	---	300,000
(FC)	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA.....	---	1,210,000	---	1,210,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	---	360,000	---	360,000
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA.....	95,000	---	95,000	---
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CORONADO, CA.....	---	---	275,000	---
	SONOMA COUNTY VERNAL POOLS, CA.....	---	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	WHITewater RIVER BASIN, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
COLORADO					
(FDP)	BOXELDER, SPRING, AND DRY CREEKS, FT COLLINS, CO.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MANITOU SPRINGS, CO.....	360,000	---	360,000	---
(FC)	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO.....	---	150,000	---	150,000
CONNECTICUT					
(FDP)	CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(COM)	CONNECTICUT R BSN - NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE, CT, MA, NH	100,000	---	100,000	---
DELAWARE					
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	210,000	---	210,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, DE, NJ, & PA...	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000
FLORIDA					
	BISCAYNE BAY, FL.....	---	---	700,000	---
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA STUDY, FL.....	780,000	---	780,000	---
(SP)	COLLIER COUNTY, FL.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FL.....	65,000	---	65,000	---
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL.....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	HILLSBORO CANAL, FL.....	37,000	---	37,000	---
	HILLSBORO INLET, FL.....	---	---	150,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL.....	---	282,000	---	282,000
	MIAMI RIVER SEDIMENTS.....	---	---	---	300,000
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL.....	---	229,000	---	229,000
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL.....	---	980,000	---	980,000
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL.....	---	1,280,000	---	1,280,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL.....	---	850,000	---	850,000
(FDP)	PERDIDO KEY, FL.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	266,000	---	266,000	---
	PORT EVERGLADES, FL.....	---	---	150,000	---
	ST JOHNS RIVER WATER QUALITY, FL.....	---	---	400,000	---
	ST PETERSBURG (SEC. 216), FL.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER AND BIG BEND, FL.....	130,000	---	250,000	---
	TAMPA HARBOR, SEDDON CHANNEL, FL.....	---	---	600,000	---
GEORGIA					
(BE)	ATLANTA COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW TREATMENT, GA.....	---	---	---	200,000
(N)	GLYNN COUNTY BEACHES, GA.....	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC.....	100,000	---	100,000	---

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
HAWAII					
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	---	180,000	---	180,000
(N)	KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, HI.....	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI.....	330,000	---	330,000	---
IDAHO					
(FDP)	LOWER BOISE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES STUDY, ID.....	227,000	---	227,000	---
ILLINOIS					
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL.....	210,000	---	210,000	---
(RDP)	CHICAGO RIVER, NORTH BRANCH (1946 MOD), IL.....	147,000	---	147,000	---
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL.....	381,000	---	381,000	---
(RDP)	FREEPORT, IL.....	140,000	---	140,000	---
	ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL, IL.....	---	---	---	500,000
	ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION, IL.....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST CHICAGO, IL.....	377,000	---	377,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	8,500,000	---	8,500,000	---
(RDP)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	35,000	---	35,000	---
INDIANA					
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, MARION COUNTY (SOUTH), IN.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER, CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN.....	300,000	---	300,000	3,700,000
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN.....	---	---	---	200,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), IN.....	---	---	---	310,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, DYER, IN.....	---	---	150,000	---
	KOONTZ LAKE, IN.....	---	---	200,000	---
	OHIO RIVER SHORELINE FLOOD PROTECTION, IN.....	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	ORANGE COUNTY (LOST RIVER), IN.....	243,000	---	243,000	---
(FDP)	ST JOSEPH RIVER, SOUTH BEND, IN.....	100,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER TIPPECANOE RIVER BASIN, IN.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, IN & IL (MIDDLE REAC	155,000	---	300,000	---
	WABASH RIVER, BREVOORT LEVEE, IN.....	---	---	200,000	---
IOWA					
(FC)	GREEN BAY LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DIST.....	---	---	330,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, IA, IL, & MO.....	---	---	250,000	---
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, IA.....	---	213,000	---	213,000
(FC)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, PUMPING FACILITIES, IA.....	---	100,000	---	---



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
KANSAS					
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS.....	---	115,000	---	115,000
(FDP)	MARYSVILLE, KS.....	77,000	---	77,000	---
(RCP)	SALINA, KS.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	TOPEKA, KS.....	---	---	---	225,000
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS.....	---	284,000	---	284,000
KENTUCKY					
(FDP)	EAST FORK OF THE LITTLE SANDY RIVER, KY.....	143,000	---	143,000	---
	GRAYSON LAKE REALLOCATION STUDY.....	---	---	85,000	---
	HAZARD, KY.....	---	---	---	250,000
	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, LOCK ADDITION, KY.....	---	---	---	2,000,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY.....	---	2,180,000	---	2,180,000
	METROPOLITAN CINCINNATI, NORTHERN KENTUCKY, KY.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY.....	---	1,250,000	---	1,250,000
(FDP)	SALT RIVER BASIN, KY.....	225,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN/OHIO RIVER MAINSTEM STUDY, KY, IL & IN.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
LOUISIANA					
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	160,000	---	160,000	---
	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE-JUMP WATERWAY, LA.....	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	BOSSIER PARISH, LA.....	830,000	---	830,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA.....	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA.....	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON - ORLEANS PARISHES, LA.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	LAKE CHARLES SHIP CHAN, BY-PASS AND GEN ANCHORAGE AREA	300,000	---	300,000	---
	MERMENTAU, VERMILLION, & CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU	---	---	---	---
	TECHE.....	---	---	400,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET BANK EROSION, LA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA PARISH, LA.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
MARYLAND					
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.....	225,000	---	225,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD.....	585,000	---	585,000	---
	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES, MD.....	---	---	292,000	---
MASSACHUSETTS					
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA.....	---	330,000	---	330,000
	BROCTON, MA.....	---	---	350,000	---
(FC)	SAUGUS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MA.....	---	1,640,000	---	1,640,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
<b>MINNESOTA</b>					
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN.....	110,000	---	110,000	---
	RED RIVER AT GRAND MARAIS OUTLET, MN.....	---	---	200,000	---
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>					
(FDP)	EAST FORK BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION, MS.....	165,000	---	165,000	---
(FDP)	HANCOCK, HARRISON AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MS.....	550,000	---	550,000	---
	JACKSON COUNTY INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLY, MS.....	---	---	40,000	---
(FDP)	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	LOWNDES COUNTY PORT BARGE FLEETING AREA.....	---	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS.....	260,000	---	260,000	---
<b>MISSOURI</b>					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	COLDWATER CREEK, MO.....	---	48,000	---	48,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, VICINITY OF ST LOUIS, MO.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNIT L-246, CUTOFF LAKE,,	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
	ST LOUIS REGION, MO.....	---	---	800,000	---
	STE GENEVIEVE, MO.....	---	---	---	3,200,000
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	59,000	---	59,000	---
<b>NEBRASKA</b>					
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE.....	15,000	---	15,000	---
(FDP)	BURT-WASHINGTON COUNTIES, NE.....	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE.....	---	109,000	---	109,000
<b>NEVADA</b>					
(FDP)	BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NV.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH AND TRIBUTARIES, PITTMAN WASH, NV.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV.....	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV.....	---	3,685,000	---	3,685,000
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>					
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHNL EXTENSION-CARTERET, NJ TO HOWLAND HOO	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SP)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NJ.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ.....	380,000	---	380,000	---
(SP)	CAPE MAY POINT, NJ.....	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	158,000	---	158,000	---
	HACKENSACK RIVER BASIN, NJ & NY.....	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, NJ.....	490,000	---	740,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ.....	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000
(FDP)	MANASQUAN RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	140,000	---	140,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HBR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, CLAREMONT TERMINAL	---	500,000	---	500,000



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(SP)	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ.....	---	---	---	17,000,000
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ.....	320,000	---	320,000	---
	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ.....	---	---	---	2,800,000
(SP)	SOUTH RIVER AT OLD BRIDGE AND SAYREVILLE, NJ.....	---	---	500,000	---
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ.....	490,000	---	490,000	---
NEW MEXICO					
(FDP)	ALBUQUERQUE ARROYOS, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM...	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	LAS CRUCES, EL PASO AND VICINITY, NM.....	70,000	---	70,000	---
(FDP)	RIO RANCHO, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	ROCKY ARROYO/DARK CANYON, PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES,	390,000	---	390,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JUAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	450,000	---	450,000	---
NEW YORK					
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY.....	160,000	---	160,000	---
	ARTHUR KILL CHANL-HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TRMNL, NY & NJ..	---	---	---	500,000
	EAST RIVER, NY.....	---	---	500,000	---
	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	---	---	300,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(SP)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY.....	---	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY (SEC 401, P L 101-596).....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	RARITAN BAY ANCHORAGES, NY AND NJ CHANNELS, NY & NJ...	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	REYNOLD'S CHANNEL AND NEW YORK STATE BOAT CHANNEL, NY.	350,000	---	350,000	---
	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY.....	---	---	475,000	---
	YONKERS SHORELINE, NY.....	---	---	400,000	---
NORTH CAROLINA					
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, OCEAN ISLE BEACH PORTION, NC	---	216,000	---	216,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR-NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC.....	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC.....	210,000	---	210,000	---
(BE)	FORT FISHER AND VICINITY, NC.....	---	338,000	---	338,000
	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	---	---	50,000	---
	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	---	---	---	158,000
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, NC & SC.....	---	656,000	---	656,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR OCEAN BAR, NC.....	---	734,000	---	734,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, CHANNEL WIDENING, NC.....	---	660,000	---	660,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD AND LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND..	50,000	---	50,000	---

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
OHIO					
(FDP)	DAYTON, OH (MIAMI RIVER BASIN).....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	LAKE ERIE TO OHIO RIVER, OH & PA.....	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH, KY.	---	490,000	---	490,000
OKLAHOMA					
(FDP)	BIRD CREEK BASIN, OK.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH CANADIAN RIVER, OK.....	125,000	---	125,000	---
OREGON					
(FDP)	AMAZON CREEK WETLANDS, OR.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA..	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA...	---	641,000	---	641,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR (DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION).....	---	830,000	---	830,000
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR.....	285,000	---	285,000	---
(FDP)	MIDDLE FORK WILLAMETTE FISHERY RESORATION, OR.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH SANTIAM FISHERY RESTORATION, OR.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TRESTLE BAY RESTORATION, OR.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR.....	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW.....	---	---	130,000	---
PENNSYLVANIA					
(FC)	BROAD TOP REGION, PA.....	---	---	---	400,000
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK, PA.....	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA (REALLOCATION).....	---	283,000	---	283,000
(FC)	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN, PA.....	---	---	450,000	---
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER CORRIDOR, PA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA.....	---	275,000	---	275,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA.....	---	553,000	---	553,000
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN, PA.....	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	---	4,400,000	---	4,400,000
(FDP)	MILTON, PA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PA.....	---	460,000	---	460,000
(FDP)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN AREA, PA.....	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN FISH RESTORATION, PA, NY & MD.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (LEEVE RAISING), PA.....	---	818,000	---	818,000



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
PUERTO RICO					
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR.....	---	231,000	---	575,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR.....	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FDP)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR.....	256,000	---	306,000	---
(FDP)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR.....	---	1,208,000	---	1,208,000
SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING/WIDENING).....	725,000	---	725,000	---
(FDP)	CHARLESTON STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, SC.....	370,000	---	370,000	---
	POCOTALIGO RIVER AND SWAMP, SC.....	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	SOUTH CAROLINA SHORES, NORTH PORTION, SC.....	188,000	---	188,000	---
SOUTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	ABERDEEN AND VICINITY, SD.....	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL, SD.....	30,000	---	30,000	---
(RCP)	OAHE DAM TO LAKE SHARPE, SD.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD.....	---	370,000	---	370,000
TENNESSEE					
	BLACK FOX, OAKLAND SPRINGS WETLAND AREA.....	---	---	90,000	---
	KNOXVILLE, TN.....	---	---	250,000	---
TEXAS					
(FDP)	BOWIE COUNTY LEVEE, TX.....	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(RCP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES - ADDICKS & BARKER RESERVO	400,000	---	400,000	---
	COLONIAS ALONG U.S.-MEXICO BORDER, TX.....	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	464,000	---	464,000	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX.....	---	---	600,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX..	---	700,000	---	700,000
(RCP)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES, TX.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX.....	939,000	---	939,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - CORPUS CHRISTI BAY TO PORT ISABEL, TX.....	225,000	---	225,000	---
	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN).....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	800,000	---	800,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX.....	---	692,000	---	692,000
	JEFFERSON COUNTY, TX.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBS, SALT WATER BARRIER, TX.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TX.....	450,000	---	450,000	---

October 22, 1993

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

25917

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU LAKE, TX.....	265,000	---	265,000	---
(FDP)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, CHANNEL TO ORANGE, TX.....	265,000	---	265,000	---
(FC)	SHOAL CREEK, AUSTIN, TX.....	---	213,000	---	213,000
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX.....	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX.....	830,000	---	830,000	---
	UTAH				
(FDP)	SEVIER RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	VERMONT				
(FDP)	WINOOSKI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ICE FLOW, VT.....	169,000	---	169,000	---
	VIRGINIA				
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION STUDY, SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	---	2,000,000	---	780,000
	WASHINGTON				
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISING, WA.....	535,000	---	535,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM (ADDITIONAL STORAGE), WA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	NOOKSACK RIVER, WA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA.....	382,000	---	382,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV.....	---	225,000	---	225,000
	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, WV.....	---	---	400,000	---
(COM)	KANAWHA RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, WV (MARLINTON/GREEN)	324,000	---	324,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV.....	309,000	---	309,000	---
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	---	1,878,000	---	1,878,000
	MONONGAHELA RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, WV.....	---	---	600,000	---
(RDP)	OCEANA, WV.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA COMPREHENSIVE, WV.....	---	---	500,000	---
	WISCONSIN				
	LOWER KINNICKINNICK RIVER, MILWAUKEE, WI.....	---	---	200,000	---
	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
	WYOMING				
(FDP)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY.....	438,000	---	438,000	---

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS					
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES.....	9,340,000	---	9,340,000	---
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA					
MISCELLANEOUS					
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION.....	3,600,000	---	4,000,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.....	7,600,000	---	7,600,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN STUDIES, MISSISSIPPI AND MISSOURI.....	---	---	2,000,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS (SEC. 401).....	---	---	250,000	---
	HARBORS - DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL AREA STUDY.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES.....	490,000	---	490,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE).....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT..	250,000	---	250,000	---
	SEC. 219 ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.....	---	---	1,500,000	---
	SEC. 307 WATER QUALITY PROJECTS.....	---	---	2,000,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY).....	690,000	---	690,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.....	900,000	---	900,000	---
	TOTAL.....	17,430,000	---	23,580,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	32,700,000	---	33,000,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	122,374,000	61,430,000	153,271,000	96,797,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-26,204,000	---	-42,528,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	96,170,000	61,430,000	110,743,000	96,797,000
TYPE OF PROJECT:					
(N)	NAVIGATION				
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL				
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL				
(MP)	MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER				
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION				
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION				
(RCP)	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT				
(RDP)	REVIEW OF DEFERRED PROJECT				
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE				
(SPEC)	SPECIAL				



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
ALABAMA			
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL.....	2,200,000	2,200,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOBIBGEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOBIBGEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	---	4,000,000
ALASKA			
	BETHEL, AK.....	---	2,000,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK.....	400,000	400,000
(N)	SITKA HARBOR, AK.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ.....	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ.....	1,600,000	1,600,000
	NOGALES WASH, AZ.....	---	200,000
	RILLITO RIVER, AZ.....	---	4,200,000
ARKANSAS			
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR (DAM SAFETY).....	10,000,000	10,000,000
	BEAVER LAKE, AR, ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.....	---	3,000,000
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR (WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT).....	525,000	525,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM (POWERHOUSE), AR (MAJOR REHAB)	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	MCLELLAN - KERR ARK RVR NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, A	11,100,000	11,100,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR.....	---	3,500,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM LEVEE & BANK STABIL, AR...	---	3,500,000
CALIFORNIA			
	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA.....	---	4,000,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	14,400,000	14,400,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	1,100,000	1,100,000
	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	---	450,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS, CA.....	500,000	500,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	550,000	550,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA.....	---	100,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA.....	---	400,000
	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	---	500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR).	2,350,000	2,350,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA.....	750,000	750,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA.....	6,792,000	6,792,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA.....	120,000,000	118,750,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA.....	645,000	645,000
	SONOMA BAYLANDS WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA.....	---	4,000,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA.....	4,838,000	4,838,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA.....	2,739,000	2,739,000
(E)	YOLO BASIN WETLANDS, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA.....	2,063,000	2,063,000
COLORADO			
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO.....	800,000	800,000
DELAWARE			
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.....	185,000	185,000
FLORIDA			
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL.....	4,996,000	4,996,000
	CANAVERAL HARBOR SAND BYPASS, FL.....	---	4,800,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	7,600,000	17,850,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL.....	2,800,000	2,800,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL.....	8,590,000	8,590,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL.....	1,600,000	400,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL.....	---	5,000,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
(BE)	LEE COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT).....	1,760,000	1,760,000
	MANATEE HARBOR, FL.....	---	3,000,000
	MELALEUCA QUARANTINE FACILITY, FL.....	---	1,000,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
	PALM BEACH COUNTY BEACHES (OCEAN RIDGE), FL.....	---	200,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL.....	400,000	1,900,000
GEORGIA			
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
HAWAII			
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HAWAII, HI.....	3,578,000	3,578,000
(N)	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HAWAII, HI.....	4,210,000	4,210,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	4,640,000	4,640,000
ILLINOIS			
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICT, IL & MO (DEF C CASINO BEACH, IL.....	500,000	500,000
		---	820,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
(N)	FOUR LOCKS, ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (MAJOR REHAB).....	5,200,000	5,200,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 13, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB).....	5,060,000	5,060,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 15, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB).....	11,330,000	11,330,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REHAB).....	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL.....	4,200,000	4,200,000
	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL.....	---	13,000,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO.....	20,350,000	7,850,000
	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL.....	---	5,000,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY.....	110,314,000	110,314,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.....	19,455,000	19,455,000
INDIANA			
(FC)	EVANSVILLE, IN.....	500,000	500,000
	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN.....	---	500,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN.....	16,000,000	16,000,000
IOWA			
	DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA.....	---	2,700,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K.....	11,800,000	11,800,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, PUMPING FACILITIES, IA.....	---	825,000
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES, DES MOINES, IA.....	2,070,000	2,070,000
KENTUCKY			
(FC)	FRANKFORT, SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY.....	1,750,000	1,750,000
	SALYERSVILLE, KY.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY.....	1,400,000	1,400,000
LOUISIANA			
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA.....	2,967,000	2,967,000
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORM WATER DISCHARGE.....	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (JEFFERSON PARISH).....	9,619,000	24,119,000
		---	200,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	2,977,000	2,977,000
	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA.....	---	6,300,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L.....	6,161,000	6,161,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	1,233,000	1,233,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L.....	32,847,000	145,000,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)...	5,770,000	5,770,000
MAINE			
	ST. JOHN RIVER (IRRIG/CONSERV).....	---	252,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
MARYLAND			
	ANACOSTIA RIVER, MD & DC.....	---	700,000
MASSACHUSETTS			
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA.....	11,400,000	11,400,000
MICHIGAN			
	CLINTON RIVER SPILLWAY, MI.....	---	2,000,000
MINNESOTA			
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK, MN.....	1,050,000	1,050,000
(FC)	CHASKA, MN.....	5,600,000	5,600,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR CHANNEL EXTENSION, MN & WI.....	886,000	886,000
(FC)	ROCHESTER, MN.....	22,130,000	22,130,000
	SILVER BAY HARBOR, MN.....	---	2,600,000
(FC)	ST PAUL, MN.....	3,651,000	3,651,000
	STILLWATER, MN.....	---	2,400,000
MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	---	800,000
	SOWASHEE CREEK, MS.....	---	3,240,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	16,900,000	16,900,000
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	5,200,000	5,200,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO.....	7,800,000	7,800,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO.....	3,489,000	3,489,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO.....	4,535,000	4,535,000
NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	74,000	74,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.....	2,881,000	2,881,000
NEVADA			
	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV.....	---	3,000,000
NEW JERSEY			
	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK, NJ.....	---	1,000,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NJ..	---	1,500,000
	SALEM RIVER, NJ.....	---	1,500,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	34,800,000	34,800,000
NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	COCHITI WETFIELDS, NM.....	10,552,000	10,552,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	2,125,000	2,125,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE..	9,000,000	9,000,000
NEW YORK			
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	8,756,000	10,756,000
	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET-ROCKAWAY INLET & JAMAICA BAY, NY..	---	3,280,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.....	28,500,000	28,500,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &..	2,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	NORTH ELLENVILLE, NY (DEF CORR).....	1,900,000	1,900,000
	ONONDAGA LAKE STORM WATER DISCHARGE.....	---	2,000,000
	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	---	4,000,000



TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC.....	4,550,000	4,550,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
	LAKE GASTON, AQUATIC VEGETATION, NC & VA.....	---	200,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC.....	7,020,000	7,020,000
(BE)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC.....	110,000	110,000
	WILMINGTON HARBOR OCEAN BAR, NC.....	---	5,266,000
(FC)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY).....	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB).....	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND.....	9,200,000	9,200,000
OHIO			
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH.....	1,900,000	1,900,000
	WEST COLOMBUS, OH.....	---	9,000,000
OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK.....	14,500,000	14,500,000
OREGON			
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA.....	7,422,000	7,422,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE I, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)..	7,600,000	7,600,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)..	1,000,000	1,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA.....	6,500,000	6,500,000
	COLUMBIA RIVER INDIAN TRIBE IN LIEU FISHING SITES.....	---	3,900,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.....	450,000	450,000
	UMPQUA RIVER, WINCHESTER BAY, OR.....	---	100,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA..	22,000,000	22,000,000
	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA.....	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA.....	17,917,000	17,917,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &	4,700,000	4,700,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT).....	410,000	410,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, PA.....	---	10,000,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA.....	1,074,000	1,074,000
PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR.....	15,600,000	15,600,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
RHODE ISLAND			
	NARRAGANSETT TOWN BEACH, NARRAGANSETT, RI.....	---	150,000
SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	5,820,000	5,820,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	10,500,000	---
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, WILDLIFE MITIGATION, S	4,839,000	4,839,000
TENNESSEE			
(MP)	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (DAM SAFETY).....	6,800,000	6,800,000
TEXAS			
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX.....	600,000	600,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX.....	9,300,000	9,300,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX.....	5,000,000	5,000,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX.....	10,700,000	10,725,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX.....	10,500,000	10,500,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX.....	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	GIWW - BRAZOS RIVER FLOODGATES, TX (MAJOR REHAB).....	4,600,000	4,600,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX.....	3,875,000	3,875,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX.....	100,000	100,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX.....	5,600,000	5,600,000
(FC)	RED RIVER CHLORIDE, TX & OK.....	2,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY).....	12,500,000	12,500,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX.....	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX.....	3,300,000	3,300,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	---	1,000,000
VIRGINIA			
(FC)	JAMES R OLIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, VA.....	4,100,000	4,100,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA.....	1,700,000	1,700,000
	RICHMOND FILTRATION PLANT, VA.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA.....	900,000	900,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT).....	850,000	850,000
WASHINGTON			
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER, SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS, WA.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA.....	2,268,000	2,268,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID..	48,300,000	49,500,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, WA.....	7,200,000	7,200,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE).....	16,900,000	16,900,000
WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	17,100,000	45,600,000
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH.....	22,000,000	22,000,000
	SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WV..	---	3,500,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	56,500,000	56,600,000
WISCONSIN			
	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI.....	---	1,467,000
MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT).....	8,500,000	11,000,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103).....	1,500,000	2,000,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING (SECTION 208).....	500,000	500,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)..	7,500,000	7,500,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION.....	18,920,000	18,920,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205).....	22,000,000	22,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES.....	35,000	35,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES.....	170,000	170,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION (SECTION 111).....	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	3,000,000	4,100,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	7,500,000	8,130,000
	WETLAND AND AQUATIC HABITAT CREATION.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-65,486,000	-165,406,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL.....		1,206,237,000	1,400,875,000
TYPE OF PROJECT:			
(N)	NAVIGATION		
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL		
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL		
(MP)	MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER		

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
SURVEYS:			
GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO.....	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS.....	2,020,000	2,020,000
(FDP)	JACKSON AND TRENTON, TN.....	610,000	610,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN.....	400,000	400,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA.....	315,000	315,000
PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:			
	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE REGION), AR	---	2,400,000
	LOWER WHITE RIVER, BIG CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, AR....	---	175,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	3,645,000	6,220,000
CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	91,300,000	91,300,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR.....	512,000	512,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	23,400,000	23,400,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO, CONSOLIDATED.....	10,100,000	10,100,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR.....	260,000	260,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.....	6,700,000	6,700,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	28,000,000	28,000,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, MS & LA....	2,100,000	2,100,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.....	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	6,700,000	6,700,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCL COW PEN CREEK), MS	331,000	331,000
(FC)	SARDIS DAM, MS (DAM SAFETY).....	11,528,000	11,528,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(37,743,000)	(37,743,000)
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	8,322,000	8,322,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS.....	4,100,000	4,100,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER, MS.....	696,000	696,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS.....	200,000	200,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN.....	2,400,000	2,400,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION.....	225,874,000	225,874,000
MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	66,579,000	66,579,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR.....	583,000	583,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	4,916,000	4,916,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO.....	9,129,000	9,129,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA.....	2,217,000	2,217,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR.....	1,652,000	1,652,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	13,694,000	13,694,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR DEVILS SWAMP, LA.....	230,000	230,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	120,000	120,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA.....	710,000	710,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA.....	8,000	8,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA.....	39,000	39,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA.....	4,736,000	4,736,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	2,620,000	2,620,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS.....	269,000	269,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS.....	217,000	217,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(18,443,000)	(26,243,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS.....	2,244,000	3,444,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	1,672,000	1,672,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS.....	2,333,000	3,833,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS.....	1,421,000	1,421,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS.....	2,677,000	4,177,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS.....	2,784,000	2,784,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS.....	2,465,000	4,665,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	1,330,000	2,730,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS.....	410,000	410,000



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	BUDGET ESTIMATE	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)		YAZOO BACKWATER, MS.....	447,000	447,000
(FC)		YAZOO CITY, MS.....	660,000	660,000
(FC)		WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	3,782,000	4,282,000
(N)		MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN.....	1,595,000	1,595,000
(FC)		INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.....	1,348,000	1,348,000
(FC)		MAPPING.....	948,000	948,000
		<b>SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE.....</b>	<b>133,860,000</b>	<b>142,160,000</b>
		<b>REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....</b>	<b>-20,379,000</b>	<b>-25,379,000</b>
		<b>TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.....</b>	<b>343,000,000</b>	<b>348,875,000</b>

## TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION  
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
ALABAMA			
(FC)	ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL.....	4,681,000	6,800,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOBIBGEE RIVERS, AL.....	15,496,000	20,000,000
	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL.....	---	529,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL.....	3,014,000	4,000,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	3,169,000	3,169,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL.....	23,024,000	25,000,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	5,878,000	5,878,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOBIBGEE WATERWAY, AL & MS.....	18,049,000	20,000,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA.....	6,842,000	6,842,000
ALASKA			
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK.....	1,750,000	1,750,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK.....	1,419,000	1,869,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK.....	603,000	603,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK.....	292,000	292,000
(N)	KETCHIKAN, THOMAS BASIN, AK.....	270,000	270,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK.....	191,000	191,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK.....	349,000	349,000
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS, AK.....	70,000	70,000
AMERICAN SAMOA			
(N)	OFU HARBOR, AS.....	255,000	255,000
ARIZONA			
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ.....	982,000	982,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ.....	876,000	876,000
	TUCSON DIVERSION CHANNEL, AZ.....	---	550,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ.....	102,000	102,000
ARKANSAS			
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR.....	4,295,000	4,295,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR.....	4,147,000	4,147,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR.....	1,123,000	1,123,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR.....	5,185,000	5,185,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	6,691,000	6,691,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR.....	7,209,000	7,209,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR.....	1,014,000	1,014,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR.....	1,026,000	1,026,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR.....	1,007,000	1,007,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR.....	4,737,000	4,737,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR.....	480,000	480,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	26,247,000	26,247,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR.....	2,254,000	2,254,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR.....	4,072,000	4,072,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR.....	1,313,000	1,313,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR.....	3,702,000	3,702,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR.....	602,000	602,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA.....	5,625,000	5,625,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	5,797,000	5,797,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR.....	2,110,000	2,110,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR.....	139,000	139,000
CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA.....	1,505,000	1,505,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA.....	1,507,000	1,507,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA.....	2,363,000	2,363,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA.....	2,968,000	2,968,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA.....	146,000	146,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA.....	1,948,000	1,948,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA.....	3,322,000	3,322,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA.....	918,000	918,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA.....	155,000	155,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA.....	95,000	495,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	3,390,000	3,590,000
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA (HANSEN DAM), CA.....	---	2,790,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER (SEPULVEDA BASIN TO ARROYO SECO), CA	---	400,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	MARINA DEL REY, CA.....	2,105,000	2,105,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA.....	176,000	176,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA.....	190,000	190,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	2,250,000	2,250,000
(N)	NAPA RIVER, CA.....	2,397,000	2,197,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA.....	1,734,000	1,734,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA.....	849,000	849,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	2,593,000	2,593,000
	OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS, CA.....	---	4,000,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA.....	845,000	845,000
(N)	PETALUMA RIVER, CA.....	1,850,000	1,850,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA.....	2,064,000	2,064,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	2,342,000	2,342,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA.....	404,000	404,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.....	882,000	882,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA.....	151,000	151,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA.....	150,000	150,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA.....	2,221,000	2,221,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA...	896,000	896,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA.....	2,208,000	2,208,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA.....	1,952,000	1,952,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA.....	1,427,000	1,427,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA.....	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	2,824,000	2,824,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	1,625,000	1,625,000
	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR, CA.....	---	100,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA.....	1,459,000	2,259,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA.....	2,020,000	2,020,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA.....	1,307,000	1,307,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA.....	19,000	19,000
COLORADO			
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO.....	362,000	362,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO.....	663,000	663,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO.....	534,000	534,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO.....	2,336,000	2,336,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO.....	655,000	655,000
CONNECTICUT			
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT.....	434,000	434,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT.....	509,000	509,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT.....	237,000	237,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT.....	787,000	787,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT.....	524,000	524,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT.....	334,000	334,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT.....	205,000	205,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT.....	514,000	514,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT.....	519,000	519,000
DELAWARE			
(N)	CEDAR CREEK, DE.....	40,000	40,000
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGES BRIDGE REPL	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE.....	200,000	200,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	11,200,000	11,200,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	37,000	37,000
(N)	MISPELLION RIVER, DE.....	1,040,000	1,040,000
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE.....	40,000	40,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE.....	3,447,000	3,447,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC.....	689,000	689,000
(N)	POTOMAC BELOW WASHINGTON, DC.....	575,000	575,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC.....	30,000	30,000
FLORIDA			
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA..	1,115,000	1,115,000
(N)	ANCLOTE RIVER, FL.....	630,000	630,000



TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL.....	2,195,000	2,195,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN, FL.....	8,189,000	8,189,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL.....	30,000	30,000
(N)	CLEARWATER PASS, FL.....	290,000	290,000
(N)	ESCAMBIA - CONECH RIVERS, FL.....	431,000	431,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL.....	1,610,000	1,610,000
(N)	FORT MYERS BEACH FL.....	430,000	430,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL.....	906,000	906,000
	HORSESHOE COVE, FL.....	---	500,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,.	134,000	375,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL.....	2,940,000	2,940,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	5,840,000	5,840,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,642,000	5,642,000
(N)	LONG BOAT PASS, FL.....	875,000	875,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL.....	200,000	200,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL.....	4,284,000	4,284,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL.....	67,000	67,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL.....	1,225,000	1,225,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL.....	391,000	391,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	65,000	65,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL.....	3,044,000	3,044,000
(N)	ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL.....	467,000	467,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL.....	3,636,000	3,636,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL.....	50,000	50,000
GEORGIA			
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA.....	5,016,000	5,016,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &.	3,959,000	3,959,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA.....	1,877,000	1,877,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	3,474,000	3,474,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA.....	6,426,000	6,426,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA.....	3,793,000	3,793,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC.....	7,350,000	7,350,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC.....	7,021,000	7,021,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL, GA.....	4,915,000	4,915,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, GA.....	481,000	481,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA.....	9,634,000	9,634,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA.....	156,000	156,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL.....	4,690,000	4,690,000
HAWAII			
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI.....	94,000	94,000
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR, HI.....	100,000	100,000
(N)	PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	2,489,000	2,489,000
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID.....	5,725,000	5,725,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID.....	7,108,000	7,108,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID.....	899,000	899,000
ILLINOIS			
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL.....	1,693,000	1,693,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL.....	3,332,000	3,332,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL.....	1,901,000	1,901,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	476,000	476,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL.....	410,000	410,000
(N)	ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL.....	110,000	110,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL.....	1,001,000	1,001,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN.....	19,332,000	19,332,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL.....	1,723,000	1,723,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL.....	434,000	434,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL.....	3,937,000	3,937,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	13,071,000	13,071,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	85,590,000	85,590,000
	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	---	150,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL.....	3,704,000	3,704,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	505,000	505,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
INDIANA			
(FC)	BEVERLY SHORES, IN.....	48,000	48,000
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN.....	520,000	520,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN.....	1,302,000	1,302,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN.....	150,000	150,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN.....	530,000	530,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN.....	784,000	784,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN.....	534,000	534,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN.....	369,000	369,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN.....	71,000	449,000
(FC)	MISSISSINAWA LAKE, IN.....	704,000	704,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN.....	1,027,000	1,027,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN.....	530,000	530,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN.....	772,000	772,000
IOWA			
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA.....	2,837,000	2,837,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA..	65,000	65,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	5,473,000	5,473,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA.....	2,832,000	2,832,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA.....	2,976,000	2,976,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA.....	3,258,000	3,258,000
KANSAS			
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS.....	1,410,000	1,410,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS.....	734,000	734,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS.....	480,000	480,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS.....	809,000	809,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS.....	845,000	845,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS.....	675,000	675,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS.....	2,182,000	2,182,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS.....	1,194,000	1,194,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS.....	894,000	894,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS.....	1,482,000	1,482,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS.....	1,737,000	1,737,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS.....	871,000	871,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS.....	1,795,000	1,795,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS.....	1,921,000	1,921,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS.....	377,000	377,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS.....	1,726,000	1,726,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS.....	1,256,000	1,256,000
KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY.....	6,574,000	6,574,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,416,000	1,416,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY.....	1,035,000	1,035,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY.....	907,000	1,407,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY.....	1,061,000	1,061,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY.....	810,000	810,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY.....	965,000	965,000
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY.....	525,000	525,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY.....	1,121,000	1,121,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY.....	815,000	815,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY.....	1,574,000	1,574,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,312,000	1,312,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY.....	1,009,000	1,009,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,850,000	1,850,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY.....	19,000	19,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY.....	613,000	613,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY.....	42,000	42,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY.....	1,756,000	1,756,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV....	58,502,000	59,002,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	6,243,000	6,243,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	742,000	742,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,271,000	1,271,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	851,000	1,271,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY.....	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY.....	842,000	842,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
LOUISIANA			
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	6,150,000	9,150,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA.....	815,000	815,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA.....	431,000	431,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA.....	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA.....	940,000	940,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA.....	115,000	115,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA.....	9,176,000	9,176,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA.....	1,860,000	1,860,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION.....	13,795,000	13,795,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA.....	2,250,000	2,250,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA.....	301,000	301,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA.....	49,000	49,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA.....	1,525,000	1,525,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	40,470,000	42,970,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.....	12,810,000	12,810,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA.....	2,470,000	2,470,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,.	5,908,000	5,908,000
(FC)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA.....	1,698,000	1,698,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA.....	184,000	184,000
MARYLAND			
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD.....	371,000	371,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	431,000	431,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA.....	10,470,000	10,470,000
(N)	BROAD CREEK, MD.....	45,000	45,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER, MD.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV.....	94,000	94,000
(N)	HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD.....	66,000	66,000
(N)	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD.....	820,000	820,000
(N)	ISLAND CREEK ST GEORGE ISLAND, MD.....	45,000	45,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV.....	1,318,000	1,318,000
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD.....	40,000	40,000
(N)	NORTHEAST RIVER, MD.....	55,000	55,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD....	67,000	67,000
(N)	RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD.....	403,000	403,000
(N)	SLAUGHTER CREEK, MD.....	380,000	380,000
(N)	TRED AVON RIVER, MD.....	69,000	69,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD.....	633,000	633,000
MASSACHUSETTS			
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA.....	362,000	362,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA.....	302,000	302,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA.....	441,000	441,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA.....	9,731,000	9,731,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA.....	177,000	177,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA.....	153,000	153,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA.....	333,000	333,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA.....	348,000	348,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA.....	439,000	439,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA.....	414,000	414,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA..	198,000	198,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA.....	428,000	428,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA.....	435,000	435,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA.....	453,000	453,000
MICHIGAN			
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI.....	49,000	49,000
(N)	BOLLES HARBOR, MI.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI.....	218,000	218,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI.....	556,000	556,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI.....	3,577,000	3,577,000
(N)	FLINT RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, MI.....	---	2,500,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI.....	798,000	798,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI.....	930,000	930,000
(N)	GRELICKVILLE, MI.....	119,000	119,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI.....	80,000	80,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI.....	488,000	488,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI.....	44,000	44,000



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI.....	752,000	752,000
(N)	LAC LA BELLE, MI.....	126,000	126,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI.....	123,000	123,000
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI.....	165,000	165,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI.....	2,563,000	2,563,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI.....	252,000	252,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI.....	192,000	192,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI.....	1,451,000	1,451,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI.....	164,000	164,000
(N)	NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI.....	99,000	99,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI.....	3,544,000	3,544,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI.....	144,000	144,000
(N)	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI.....	942,000	942,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI.....	135,000	135,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI.....	2,675,000	2,675,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI (DIKE DISPOSAL).....	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI.....	13,000	13,000
(N)	SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI.....	1,142,000	1,142,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI.....	1,003,000	1,003,000
(N)	ST JAMES HARBOR, MI.....	90,000	90,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI.....	1,210,000	1,210,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI.....	15,115,000	15,115,000
MINNESOTA			
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD.....	497,000	497,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI.....	4,290,000	4,290,000
(N)	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN.....	171,000	171,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	796,000	796,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	145,000	145,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN.....	1,362,000	1,362,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RIVER, MN.....	177,000	177,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN.....	2,996,000	2,996,000
	SAUK LAKE, MN.....	---	40,000
MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS.....	838,000	838,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS.....	3,000	3,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOBIGBEE RIVER, MS.....	592,000	592,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS.....	2,146,000	2,146,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	165,000	165,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS.....	1,431,000	1,431,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	3,606,000	3,606,000
	PASS CHRISTIAN HARBOR, MS.....	---	693,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA.....	270,000	270,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS.....	403,000	403,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	79,000	79,000
MISSOURI			
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO.....	392,000	392,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO.....	4,993,000	4,993,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO.....	2,550,000	2,550,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO.....	8,815,000	8,815,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO.....	841,000	841,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO.....	663,000	663,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BETWEEN OHIO AND MO RIVERS, MO & IL (REG WO	14,565,000	14,565,000
	NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO.....	---	250,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO.....	1,695,000	1,695,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO.....	1,076,000	1,076,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO.....	202,000	202,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO.....	3,093,000	3,093,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO.....	4,660,000	4,660,000
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO.....	17,000	17,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	10,000	10,000
MONTANA			
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT.....	3,657,000	3,786,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT.....	7,409,000	7,409,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
NEBRASKA			
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD.....	5,778,000	5,778,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE.....	1,632,000	1,632,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	---	200,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO..	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.....	594,000	594,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE.....	688,000	688,000
NEVADA			
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA.....	405,000	405,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV.....	276,000	276,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH.....	377,000	377,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH.....	689,000	689,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH.....	1,023,000	1,023,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH.....	445,000	445,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH.....	442,000	442,000
NEW JERSEY			
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	1,050,000	1,050,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ.....	826,000	826,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE..	12,669,000	12,669,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ.....	260,000	260,000
	MAURICE RIVER, NJ.....	---	1,500,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ.....	3,007,000	3,007,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVER, NJ.....	1,420,000	1,420,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ.....	60,000	60,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER, NJ.....	700,000	700,000
NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM.....	1,245,000	1,245,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM.....	1,739,000	1,739,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM.....	866,000	866,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM.....	271,000	271,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM.....	849,000	849,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM.....	799,000	799,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM.....	327,000	327,000
NEW YORK			
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY.....	356,000	356,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY.....	188,000	188,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY.....	495,000	495,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY.....	1,435,000	1,435,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY.....	585,000	585,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY.....	195,000	195,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY.....	1,258,000	1,258,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY.....	351,000	351,000
(N)	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY.....	70,000	70,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY.....	1,870,000	1,870,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY.....	940,000	940,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY.....	2,127,000	2,127,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY.....	500,000	500,000
(N)	JONES INLET, NY.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY.....	60,000	60,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY.....	1,366,000	1,366,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY.....	2,050,000	2,050,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ.....	4,470,000	4,470,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	740,000	740,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY.....	5,734,000	5,734,000
(N)	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	295,000	295,000
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	92,000	92,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY.....	100,000	100,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY.....	692,000	692,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY.....	489,000	489,000
NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC.....	6,117,000	6,117,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC.....	1,133,000	1,133,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC.....	378,000	378,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC.....	598,000	700,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC.....	571,000	571,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC.....	987,000	987,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	924,000	924,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	6,103,000	6,103,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC.....	1,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC.....	2,595,000	2,595,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC.....	950,000	950,000
(N)	OCRACOE INLET, NC.....	278,000	278,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC.....	1,670,000	1,670,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC.....	6,203,000	6,203,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND.....	251,000	251,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND.....	9,098,000	9,148,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND.....	243,000	243,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND.....	955,000	955,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND.....	361,000	361,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND.....	96,000	96,000
OHIO			
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,826,000	1,826,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH.....	2,155,000	2,155,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH.....	1,575,000	1,575,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH.....	713,000	713,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH.....	490,000	490,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH.....	4,868,000	4,868,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH.....	677,000	677,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,766,000	1,766,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH.....	1,677,000	1,677,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH.....	1,694,000	1,694,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH.....	1,185,000	1,185,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH.....	867,000	867,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH.....	437,000	437,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH.....	926,000	926,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH.....	612,000	612,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH.....	6,170,000	6,170,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH.....	244,000	244,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,795,000	1,795,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH.....	963,000	963,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH.....	6,896,000	7,896,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH.....	269,000	269,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH.....	387,000	387,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH.....	640,000	640,000
OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK.....	343,000	343,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK.....	653,000	653,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK.....	1,413,000	1,413,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK.....	1,343,000	1,343,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK.....	638,000	638,000
(MP)	EUFULA LAKE, OK.....	4,262,000	4,262,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK.....	2,868,000	2,868,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK.....	678,000	678,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK.....	335,000	335,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK.....	657,000	657,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK.....	1,293,000	1,293,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK.....	400,000	400,000



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK.....	2,149,000	2,149,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK.....	2,827,000	2,827,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK.....	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK.....	487,000	487,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK.....	4,000	4,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK.....	1,121,000	1,121,000
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK.....	2,861,000	2,861,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK.....	876,000	876,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK.....	1,089,000	1,089,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK.....	2,818,000	2,818,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK.....	1,202,000	1,202,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK.....	2,499,000	2,499,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK.....	747,000	747,000
OREGON			
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR.....	567,000	567,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR.....	259,000	259,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	16,200,000	16,200,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR.....	677,000	677,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	8,817,000	8,817,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA.....	9,006,000	9,006,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	374,000	374,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR.....	5,470,000	5,470,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR.....	405,000	405,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR.....	589,000	589,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR.....	1,101,000	1,101,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR.....	---	585,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR.....	2,160,000	2,160,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR.....	639,000	639,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR.....	508,000	508,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR.....	749,000	749,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR.....	2,610,000	2,610,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR.....	856,000	856,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	20,610,000	20,610,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR.....	4,857,000	4,857,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR.....	3,663,000	3,663,000
(MP)	MENARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	9,434,000	9,434,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR.....	226,000	226,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR.....	718,000	718,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR.....	733,000	733,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR.....	13,000	13,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR.....	1,301,000	1,301,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR.....	885,000	885,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR.....	460,000	460,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR.....	1,520,000	1,520,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA.....	10,892,000	10,892,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA.....	490,000	490,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA.....	172,000	172,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA.....	932,000	932,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA.....	1,498,000	1,498,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,311,000	1,311,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA.....	1,398,000	1,398,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA.....	1,059,000	1,059,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA.....	497,000	497,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA.....	994,000	994,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA.....	40,000	40,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA.....	569,000	569,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA.....	855,000	855,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA.....	537,000	537,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA.....	1,909,000	1,909,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA.....	1,493,000	1,493,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA.....	1,138,000	1,138,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA.....	1,064,000	1,064,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	16,070,000	16,070,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA.....	524,000	524,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA.....	47,000	47,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA.....	2,583,000	2,583,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA.....	1,395,000	1,395,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,745,000	1,745,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA.....	295,000	295,000
(FC)	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA.....	1,439,000	1,439,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA.....	1,425,000	1,425,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA.....	543,000	543,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA.....	753,000	753,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA.....	494,000	494,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
PUERTO RICO			
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR.....	1,355,000	1,355,000
SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC.....	2,092,000	2,092,000
(N)	BROOKGREEN GARDEN CANAL, SC.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	3,615,000	3,615,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	3,574,000	3,574,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC.....	320,000	320,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC.....	3,070,000	3,070,000
(N)	JEREMY CREEK, SC.....	3,000	3,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC.....	111,000	111,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET, SC.....	93,000	93,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC.....	1,714,000	1,714,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC.....	35,000	35,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC.....	540,000	540,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD.....	5,980,000	5,980,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD.....	182,000	182,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD.....	165,000	165,000
(MP)	FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD.....	9,986,000	9,986,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN.....	581,000	581,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND.....	9,689,000	9,689,000
TENNESSEE			
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN.....	7,533,000	7,618,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	4,905,000	4,905,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	4,454,000	4,454,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN.....	3,487,000	3,487,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	2,640,000	2,695,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	4,920,000	4,920,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN.....	13,472,000	13,472,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN.....	698,000	698,000
TEXAS			
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX.....	973,000	973,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX.....	956,000	956,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX.....	2,080,000	2,080,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX.....	3,267,000	3,267,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX.....	2,459,000	2,459,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX.....	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX.....	2,182,000	2,182,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX.....	1,378,000	1,378,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX.....	340,000	340,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX.....	1,034,000	1,034,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	10,315,000	10,315,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX.....	6,045,000	6,045,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX.....	3,000	3,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX.....	1,833,000	1,833,000
(N)	FREEMONT HARBOR, TX.....	5,458,000	5,458,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX.....	3,614,000	3,614,000
(N)	GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	1,607,000	1,607,000
(N)	GIWW - CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX.....	1,570,000	1,570,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX.....	1,947,000	1,947,000
(N)	GREENS BAYOU CHANNEL, TX.....	400,000	400,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX.....	13,476,000	13,476,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX.....	983,000	983,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	11,034,000	11,034,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX.....	1,029,000	1,029,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX.....	230,000	230,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX.....	2,371,000	2,371,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	3,445,000	3,445,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX.....	1,470,000	1,470,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX.....	1,219,000	1,219,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX.....	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	1,473,000	1,473,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX.....	860,000	860,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX.....	2,287,000	2,287,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX.....	3,342,000	3,342,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX.....	10,045,000	10,045,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX.....	4,326,000	5,326,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX.....	2,692,000	2,692,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX.....	1,585,000	1,585,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX.....	1,788,000	1,788,000
(N)	TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX.....	2,599,000	2,599,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	501,000	501,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX.....	4,278,000	4,278,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	2,214,000	2,814,000
VERMONT			
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT.....	745,000	745,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY.....	42,000	42,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT.....	509,000	509,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT.....	584,000	584,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT.....	753,000	753,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT.....	463,000	463,000
VIRGINIA			
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA.....	281,000	281,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA.....	3,366,000	3,366,000
(N)	BROAD CREEK, VA.....	189,000	189,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA.....	847,000	847,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA.....	1,065,000	1,065,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA.....	1,725,000	1,725,000
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	525,000	525,000
(N)	HOSKINS CREEK, VA.....	511,000	511,000



TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA.....	1,299,000	1,299,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC.....	7,401,000	7,401,000
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA.....	1,293,000	1,293,000
(N)	LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA.....	200,000	200,000
(N)	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA.....	778,000	778,000
(N)	MONROE BAY AND CREEK, VA.....	400,000	400,000
(N)	NANSEMOND RIVER, VA.....	429,000	429,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	100,000	100,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA.....	7,103,000	7,103,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA.....	339,000	339,000
(N)	PAGAN RIVER, VA.....	400,000	400,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA.....	2,233,000	2,233,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA.....	75,000	75,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT MT VERNON, VA.....	309,000	309,000
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA.....	452,000	452,000
(N)	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA.....	30,000	30,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA.....	174,000	174,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA.....	1,118,000	1,118,000
(N)	WHITINGS CREEK, MIDDLESEX CO, VA.....	195,000	195,000
(N)	WILLOUGHBY CHANNEL, VA.....	155,000	155,000
WASHINGTON			
(N)	ANACORTES HARBOR, WA.....	20,000	20,000
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA.....	28,000	28,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA.....	15,437,000	15,437,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR.....	18,000	18,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER SYSTEM OPERATION REVIEW, WA, ID, MT & O	640,000	640,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA.....	890,000	890,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA.....	7,529,000	7,529,000
(FC)	HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA.....	945,000	945,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	7,661,000	7,661,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA.....	5,165,000	5,165,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	4,617,000	4,617,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	5,668,000	5,668,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	7,181,000	7,181,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, VIRGIL B BENNINGTON LAKE, WA.....	563,000	563,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA.....	451,000	451,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA.....	1,629,000	1,629,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA.....	1,139,000	1,139,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA.....	584,000	584,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA.....	165,000	165,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA.....	392,000	392,000
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA.....	47,000	47,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR.....	11,169,000	11,169,000
(N)	WATERWAY CONNECTING PORT TOWNSEND AND OAK BAY, WA.....	43,000	43,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA.....	125,000	125,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV.....	935,000	935,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV.....	2,643,000	3,643,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	1,421,000	1,421,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV.....	946,000	946,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV.....	18,000	18,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV.....	31,000	31,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV.....	11,509,000	11,509,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV.....	1,234,000	1,234,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV.....	938,000	938,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	1,243,000	1,243,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV.....	2,832,000	2,832,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV.....	1,370,000	1,370,000
WISCONSIN			
(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI.....	265,000	265,000
(N)	BIG SUAMICO HARBOR, WI.....	184,000	184,000
(N)	CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI.....	207,000	207,000
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI.....	477,000	477,000
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI.....	2,781,000	2,781,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI.....	1,833,000	1,833,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL).....	30,000	30,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI.....	290,000	290,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI.....	70,000	70,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI.....	775,000	775,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI.....	2,874,000	2,874,000
(N)	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI.....	259,000	259,000
(N)	SAXON HARBOR, WI.....	132,000	132,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI.....	793,000	793,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY, WI.....	326,000	326,000
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI.....	86,000	86,000
WYOMING			
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY.....	1,015,000	1,015,000
MISCELLANEOUS			
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
	COST SHARE BEACH DISPOSAL (SECTION 933).....	600,000	600,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
	DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM .....	3,487,000	3,487,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING (SECTION 312).....	---	750,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDE FOR OPERATIONS (ERGO).....	4,000,000	4,000,000
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.....	6,889,000	6,889,000
	MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS.....	2,100,000	2,100,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	20,000	20,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP).....	7,000,000	7,000,000
	NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION....	3,931,000	3,931,000
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS.....	10,709,000	10,709,000
	PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS...	50,000	50,000
	REAL TIME WATER CONTROL RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	675,000	675,000
	RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES (RPI).....	400,000	400,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
	REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE & REHAB RESEARCH.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
	RIVER CONFLUENCE ICE RESEARCH.....	650,000	650,000
	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.....	3,200,000	3,200,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS.....	3,764,000	3,764,000
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS.....	4,310,000	4,310,000
	WETLANDS MITIGATION BANKING DEMONSTRATION STUDY.....	335,000	335,000
	WETLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	5,283,000	5,283,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-25,487,000	-35,480,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	1,657,700,000	1,688,990,000
TYPE OF PROJECT:			
(N)	NAVIGATION		
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL		
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL		
(MP)	MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER		



TITLE II  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION  
ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$24,770,000 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,770,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that \$14,920,000 of the funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act shall be available to carry out the activities authorized under title II of the Act as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,920,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act shall be available for feasibility studies of alternatives to the Uintah and Upalco Units.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes House language stricken by the Senate which provides that \$500,000 of the funds available for activities authorized under title II of the Central Utah Project Completion Act shall be available for expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out his responsibilities under the Act.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that appropriates \$1,000,000 for expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out his responsibilities under the Central Utah Project Completion Act.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$13,819,000 for General Investigations instead of \$13,109,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,409,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake studies and other activities to identify opportunities for water reclamation and reuse instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by

the Senate. Such activities include the San Francisco, California, Area Water Reclamation study authorized by section 1611 of Public Law 102-575 and final engineering and site preparation for the project proposed by Escondido for the Rincon Del Diablo and Olivenhain Municipal Water Districts in the San Diego, California, area.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$464,423,000 for Construction Program as proposed by the House instead of \$460,898,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have provided \$125,000 to establish a Sacramento River Information Center pursuant to section 3406(b)(16) and section 3407(e) of Public Law 102-575. Such center shall operate through a non-profit organization, under terms and conditions identified by the Bureau of Reclamation. The conferees encourage the center to support educational activities, including those targeted toward the school systems and the public at large, to promote a better understanding of the Central Valley aquatic systems and resources.

The conferees have provided \$2,750,000 to help resolve the fishery problems associated with the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's Hamilton City Pumping Plant, \$750,000 of which is intended to reimburse the District for extraordinary expenditures undertaken in fiscal year 1993, with the approval of all concerned Federal and State agencies, to make emergency, interim retrofits to the District's existing fish screen.

The conference agreement includes \$5,000,000 for the San Gabriel Basin Demonstration, California, project authorized by section 1614 of Public Law 102-575 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. This project and its peripheral components will assist Southern California in meeting its long-term water needs using local water resources which are presently contaminated but can be reclaimed through conjunctive use and treatment. This cost-shared project will produce 30,000,000 gallons per day of potable water. The conferees recognize the importance of such projects in meeting the goals of Public Law 102-575 regarding water quality and utilization of the basin as a water storage facility.

In lieu of the language contained in the House and Senate reports regarding the Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota, project, the conferees agree that the funds appropriated are to carry out activities authorized by the Garrison Diversion Reformation Act of 1986, Public Law 99-294.

The conferees agree not to take a position on the acquisition of the Lincoln Ranch in

Arizona at this time. If, in the future, acquisition of the Ranch proves feasible, due consideration will be given to the project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The conferees direct that none of the funds appropriated for Operation and Maintenance may be used for the Western Water Policy Review. Funds to carry out the Western Water Policy Review have been provided under General Administrative Expenses.

The conference agreement includes up to \$2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake repairs to the Corning Canal, Thomas Creek Siphon in California. The conferees are concerned, however, that state and local interests have not taken sufficient precautions to prevent streambed degradation impacting the siphon crossings. Therefore, to prevent future damages, the Bureau is directed to work with state and local interests to develop a plan to prevent a recurrence of the erosion problem jeopardizing the siphon operation and to inform the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, within six months of the date of enactment of this Act, of the progress on developing such a plan. Any further repairs caused by streambed degradation attributable to gravel mining operations on Thomas Creek shall be a non-Federal responsibility. This is not intended to preclude Bureau participation in a long-term solution to the problem.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOANS PROGRAM  
ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$12,900,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation Loans Program, excluding administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,563,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement also provides \$600,000 for administrative expenses of Loan Program as proposed by the House and the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Provides a loan obligation ceiling of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$18,726,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The amount provided for General Administrative Expenses includes \$2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate the Western Water Policy Review authorized in title 30 of Public Law 102-575.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 27: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which amends the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reserve Water Rights Settlement Act of 1992.

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
ARIZONA		
UPPER SAN PEDRO RIVER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	80,000	80,000
TUCSON/PHOENIX WATER CONSERVATION AND EXCHANGE STUDY..	300,000	300,000
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER FOLSOM SOUTH OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	65,000	65,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT.....	---	50,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE INVESTIGATION.....	---	20,000
SACRAMENTO VALLEY RICELANDS/WETLANDS CONJUNC. USE STUD	500,000	500,000
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	---	100,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE.....	---	10,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COMPREHENSIVE WATER.....	200,000	200,000
PUTAH CREEK FLOW OPTIMIZATION INVESTIGATION.....	50,000	50,000
COLORADO		
GRAND VALLEY PROJECT WATER CONSERVATION STUDY .....	50,000	50,000
UPPER ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY INVEST.....	125,000	125,000
YAMPA RIVER WATER SUPPLY STUDY .....	100,000	100,000
IDAHO		
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT.....	175,000	175,000
MONTANA		
FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION.....	---	200,000
MUSSELSHELL RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	80,000	80,000
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
NEW MEXICO		
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ASSESSMENT/MGMT STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
PECOS RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE.....	100,000	100,000
RIO PUERCO WATERSHED SEDIMENTATION & WATER QUALITY STU	50,000	50,000
SAN JUAN RIVER - GALLUP WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	---	500,000
NEBRASKA		
PICK SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, PRAIRIE BEND UNIT..	---	75,000
OREGON		
CARLTON LAKE RESTORATION.....	100,000	100,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	55,000	55,000
JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MGMT IMPROVEMENT STUDY.....	90,000	90,000
NORTHWEST OREGON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY .....	100,000	100,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY.....	200,000	200,000
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING.....	200,000	200,000
OWYHEE PROJECT STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	200,000	200,000
UPPER DESCHUTES RIV BASIN WATER CONSERVATION PROJ.....	120,000	320,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	100,000	100,000
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM.....	---	50,000
TEXAS		
EDWARDS ACQUIFER REG. WATER RESOURCES & MGMT STUDY....	175,000	175,000
LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN STUDY.....	190,000	190,000
RINCON BAYOU-NUECES MARSH WETLANDS.....	175,000	175,000
UTAH		
UTAH LAKE WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
WEBER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	150,000	150,000

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
<b>WYOMING</b>		
WIND RIVER BASIN STUDY.....	88,000	88,000
<b>VARIOUS</b>		
BEAR RIVER INTRESTATE WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	75,000	75,000
BEAR RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	150,000	150,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	3,234,000	3,234,000
FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT PRESERVATION & ENHANCEMENT....	50,000	50,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	900,000	900,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	455,000	455,000
LOWER COLORADO RIVER REGULATORY STORAGE STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS.....	236,000	236,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCE MGMT PLANS.....	150,000	150,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	1,346,000	1,346,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN SALMON MIGRATION WATER STUDY..	200,000	200,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION.....	200,000	200,000
WEST TEXAS/SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO WATER RESOURCE INVEST..	100,000	100,000
RECLAMATION WASTE WATER STUDIES.....	---	1,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES.....	---	-1,100,000
<b>TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....</b>	<b>12,714,000</b>	<b>13,819,000</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM</b>		
<b>CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND</b>		
<b>COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS</b>		
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECTS.....	3,023,000	3,023,000
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION.....	---	500,000
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>		
<b>CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:</b>		
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	1,825,000	1,825,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	16,015,000	20,190,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	4,814,000	4,814,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	50,000	50,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	3,535,000	3,535,000
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROJECTS.	---	5,250,000
SAN GABRIEL BASIN DEMONSTRATION.....	---	5,000,000
<b>COLORADO</b>		
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	15,444,000	15,444,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	4,193,000	4,193,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	3,958,000	3,958,000
<b>MONTANA</b>		
HUNGRY HORSE DAM.....	---	3,500,000
<b>NEBRASKA</b>		
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP.....	5,928,000	5,928,000
<b>NEVADA</b>		
NEWLANDS PROJECT.....	---	100,000
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>		
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP.....	30,000,000	32,000,000
<b>OREGON</b>		
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT.....	6,300,000	9,900,000



## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP.....	7,310,000	7,310,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT.....	3,000,000	10,000,000
MID DAKOTA PROJECT.....	---	2,000,000
TEXAS		
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TX & OK.....	---	1,400,000
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT: IRRIGATION FACILITIES.....	4,000,000	4,800,000
VARIOUS		
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT, AZ-NV.....	4,754,000	4,754,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJ., TITLE I..	8,257,000	8,257,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION.....	122,406,000	157,731,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:		
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO.....	2,395,000	2,395,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NEW MEXICO.....	2,092,000	2,092,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR, CO....	1,250,000	1,250,000
COLUMBIA & SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACT., ID,ND,MT,OR,SE,WA,WY.....	62,000	62,000
FRYINGAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO.....	400,000	400,000
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT, AZ, CA.....	51,000	51,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA.....	2,442,000	2,442,000
MC GEE CREEK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.....	100,000	100,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, IDAHO.....	315,000	315,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.....	500,000	500,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA.....	2,379,000	2,379,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS.....	700,000	700,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS.....	100,000	100,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:		
BOSTWICK DIVISION, NEBRASKA.....	230,000	1,230,000
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA.....	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA.....	560,000	560,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA.....	96,000	96,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING.....	15,000	15,000
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT - TITLE 28....	2,000,000	2,000,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESV, VARIOUS....	151,000	151,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION.....	390,000	390,000
TUALATIN PROJECT, OREGON.....	---	450,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA.....	725,000	725,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION.....	20,803,000	22,253,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:		
BITTER ROOT PROJECT, COMO DAM, MONTANA.....	500,000	500,000
BOISE PROJECT, DEER FLAT DAM, IDAHO.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, VERNAL UNIT, STEINAKER DAM, UT	1,099,000	1,099,000
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	650,000	650,000
HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH.....	341,000	341,000
INITIATE SOD CORRECTION ACTION, VARIOUS.....	18,136,000	18,136,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS & PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY....	2,500,000	2,500,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, ARIZONA.....	12,897,000	12,897,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, ARIZONA.....	14,234,000	14,234,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA.....	227,000	227,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, ARIZONA.....	7,903,000	7,903,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS.....	62,487,000	62,487,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:		
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MT.....	410,000	410,000
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UTAH.....	1,935,000	1,935,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT.....	1,100,000	1,300,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH.....	3,613,000	3,613,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT.....	7,058,000	7,258,000

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

## PROJECT TITLE

BUDGET  
ESTIMATECONFERENCE  
ALLOWANCE

## SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:

DESALTING TECHNOLOGY.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE.....	1,012,000	1,012,000
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.....	4,470,000	4,470,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.....	4,335,000	4,335,000

SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.....	10,817,000	10,817,000
---------------------------------------	------------	------------

TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND  
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS

223,571,000	260,546,000
-------------	-------------

## COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND  
AND  
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

## COLORADO

ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
DOLORES PROJECT.....	20,335,000	20,335,000

## UTAH

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT.....	18,857,000	18,857,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT.....	25,000	25,000
DRAINAGE & MINOR CONSTRUCTION: PARTICIPATING PROJECTS: DALLAS CREEK PROJECT.....	290,000	290,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES: RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.....	12,490,000	12,490,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES.....	3,751,000	3,751,000

TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT.....	62,748,000	62,748,000
--	------------	------------

## COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

## CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

## ARIZONA

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)...	160,470,000	160,470,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DIST. SYSTEMS.....	120,000	120,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS.....	18,178,000	18,178,000

TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT.....	178,768,000	178,768,000
--	-------------	-------------

## ASSOCIATED ITEMS

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	-33,239,000	-37,639,000
--	-------------	-------------

TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....	431,848,000	464,423,000
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

## LOAN PROGRAM

EASTERN MUNICIPAL CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT NO. 3....	3,800,000	3,800,000
FORT MCDOWELL INDIAN TRIBE.....	1,400,000	9,100,000
LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	600,000	600,000

TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....	5,800,000	13,500,000
--------------------------	-----------	------------

### TITLE III DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

#### APPLICATION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS

With regard to any general reductions contained in the Fiscal Year 1994 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, with the exception of activities specifically addressed by the Committees, the conferees recommend that the Department of Energy apply those reductions in the most prudent and practical manner. Any such reduction should be taken in a manner that is cost effective and generally least disruptive to the Department's missions and programs. The Department continues to maintain significant amounts of prior year uncosted balances, particularly in capital equipment and construction project accounts. In applying any general reductions, the Department should seek to reduce these balances as much as possible. Furthermore, the Department shall consult with and make their plans for these reductions available to the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees prior to implementing the reductions.

#### GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS

In recent years, general plant projects authorized under Department of Defense authorization acts have been subject to statutory funding limits on the cost of individual projects, while similar projects for civilian programs of the Department have not. The Secretary should develop guidelines using the flexibility provided to the civilian programs and the direction provided in enacted authorization acts. The Secretary should establish coordinated management guidelines and funding limits for Departmentwide application which achieves maximum programmatic efficiency and effectiveness. These revised guidelines should be submitted to the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees prior to the submission of the fiscal year 1995 budget.

#### MINORITY EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

There are currently over 440,000 Hispanic students attending 125 Hispanic-serving institutions in 15 states and Puerto Rico. These colleges and universities include some of the premier research and development facilities in the world, as well as many other excellent two- and four-year institutions. These colleges and universities are poised to make an increasingly important contribution to Department of Energy research projects and programs, particularly as the DOE plans to increase its predesignated research, development, and education funds for many minority institutions, including historically black colleges and universities.

The conferees applaud the Department of Energy's efforts to enhance the education opportunities for minority students in the areas of science and technology. The conferees strongly encourage the Department to include Hispanic-serving institutions to participate in any current or future plans to increase its predesignated or targeted research, development, and education funds.

#### ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$3,223,910,000 for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities instead of

\$3,167,634,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,249,286,000 as proposed by the Senate, deletes language proposed by the Senate restricting the funding for the gas turbine-modular helium reactor, and deletes language proposed by the House funding hydrogen research and development.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that makes funds available by transfer from the Geothermal Resources Development Fund.

#### SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The conferees agree that the solar program is funded at \$252,349,000 as indicated in the tables and the programs are to be funded at the highest level described in either the House or Senate reports, except for the reductions described in the Senate report.

**Biofuels Energy Systems.**—The Department is urged to pursue the planning of a biomass plant using switchgrass and rice straw and to submit a plan on the feasibility of such plant to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate prior to the submission of the fiscal year 1995 budget.

The conference agreement includes funds to continue ongoing research and development activities and also provides that a portion of the increase in this program for fiscal year 1994 be directed toward cost-shared validation of direct-combustion biomass technologies, including gasification technologies, injected turbines, whole tree energy, and other advanced combustion biomass technologies with a more industry-driven focus.

**Indian Energy Resources.**—The conferees recommend an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to fund and implement Indian energy resource programs in accordance with the provisions of sections 2603 and 2606 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to be administered by the Office of Technical and Financial Assistance in the energy efficiency and renewable energy organization. The conferees intend that, in allocating the funds appropriated, the Department should give priority to a mature project in which an Indian tribe has already made a substantial investment and with which the Department is already working cooperatively. In this regard, the conference is aware of the proposed Navajo transmission project in conjunction with the Western Area Power Administration and directs the Department to give every consideration to this project in allocating the funds appropriated. The conferees expect the Department to move expeditiously in allocating these funds.

#### HYDROGEN RESEARCH

The conference recommendation establishes a new line for hydrogen research. Hydrogen, as a transportation fuel available from domestic sources, has the potential to play an important role in the energy security of the United States, as well as having important environmental benefits. The laboratories of the Department of Energy have extensive experience in the production, storage, transport, and safe utilization of hydrogen. Funding at the level of \$10,000,000 is provided for the Department to accelerate its hydrogen research program through a strategy of adopting available technologies and fossil sources in the short term to build experience and infrastructure for the longer term. Development of more advanced techniques, such as fuel cells and hydrogen generation using renewable energy, should be continued, and these techniques should be phased in as they become technically and economically competitive.

Development of the transportation or power end-use technologies such as fuel cells or engines, which are applications funded in other accounts (fossil energy research and development and energy conservation), should not be funded as part of hydrogen research.

#### SUPERCONDUCTING MAGNETIC ENERGY STORAGE

The conferees recommend \$10,000,000 for a research program directed at the development of a superconducting magnetic energy storage (SMES) system. SMES, a state-of-the-art method of storing electrical energy in superconducting coils, offers the ability to discharge electricity as needed with 95 percent efficiency. Utilities using SMES could store excess nighttime production in the system and then withdraw that energy during the peak period of the day. It can also be used for spinning reserve, emergency power, transmission stability, and grid regulation. The conferees believe that the SMES system is an important energy storage technology that also is environmentally beneficial.

The conferees recognize that the superconducting magnetic energy storage program has been under development by the Department of Defense, and in order to minimize costs and to expedite progress in the development of civilian applications, the Department should, to the extent practicable, utilize developed technology.

#### NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The conferees recommend \$12,000,000 to continue the development of the passively safe Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor as proposed by the House and \$30,400,000 for the Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor/Integral Fast Reactor (ALMR/IFR) program as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees provide the full budget request of \$109,300,000 for facilities/termination. In lieu of the original budget proposal, the funds recommended are for an alternative program where the EBR-II reactor is operated through fiscal year 1996, with shutdown activities for the facility conducted in parallel with reactor operation. The funds for the termination of the MHTGR and the ALMR design are to be used to continue the program in fiscal year 1994.

#### ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The conference provides the fiscal year 1993 level of \$158,070,000. The reduction from the budget request should be applied to the significant increase in studies performed under this budget category.

#### BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The conference provides \$1,000,000 to conduct research and develop the technology for commercial exploitation in the disposal of infectious hospital waste through electron beam sterilization at a medical research center with proven experience with this technology as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement provides \$5,800,000 for the Medical University of South Carolina's Cancer/Oncology Center. This appropriation will enhance the Center's research in the areas of human molecular genetics, biological risk assessment and innovative treatments in conjunction with the Department of Energy sponsored Environmental Hazards Assessment Program and the MUSC Molecular and Structural Biology Program. These funds will support the establishment of a tumor bank to store and archive various cancers as well as further the development of radiosurgical approaches to tumors with environmental causation.

The conferees direct the Department of Energy to maintain the current location of the



national office and the co-located western regional office of the National Institute for Global Environmental Change. The conferees are concerned that the position of national director for the NIGEC Program has been vacant for over one year, and that the University of California has not completed the process of recruiting a scientist of international stature to head the program. The Secretary of Energy is requested to work with the president of the University of California to expedite the selection of a highly qualified national director.

The conferees have provided \$4,000,000 for the Environmental Biotechnology program at Florida A&M University to support research including support for principal investigators and research assistants at the graduate and undergraduate levels. This program, in addition to performing vitally needed research, will serve to increase the participation of minorities in this area of scientific endeavor.

The conferees are very supportive of the Department's Boron Neutron Capture Therapy (BNCT) Program and fully support the budget request of \$8,744,000. The conferees believe considerable progress has been made through support and funding for BNCT. The conferees are encouraged with the interest of a number of academic health centers and universities which have formed a BNCT-university consortium to advance treatment of brain tumors to patients in the United States. The conferees are aware and encourage the BNCT-university consortium interest, in conjunction with the National Cancer Institute, to involve national and international experts in the assessment of BNCT and the development of a strategic plan to further advance the treatment of brain tumors. To the extent available, the Department should use unobligated balances of up to \$2,000,000 to support this university consortium.

The conference agreement provides \$4,600,000 for the Biomedical Information Communication Center (BICC) at Oregon Health Sciences University to conduct research and develop a model for a statewide, high-speed information, education and data gathering network which will allow health care information, services and education to be delivered electronically. BICC is building a database for electronically encoding and storing elements of the medical record for the lifetime of a patient, the "lifetime clinical record". This database will be used to evaluate outcomes, and represents a way to track the efficacy and effect of medical treatments. Such databases, collected on large populations over long periods of time, hold the promise of answering questions that have never been answered about the long-term effects of low-level exposure to potential environmental hazards such as radiation or electromagnetic fields (EMF).

The conferees do not include funds for an international study of greenhouse gases to be conducted by the State of Illinois.

#### MAGNETIC FUSION

The conferees provide \$347,595,000 for the magnetic fusion energy program.

The conferees note with approval that the international thermonuclear experimental reactor (ITER) engineering design activity phase of the program has commenced. The conferees direct the Department of Energy to focus the Department's magnetic fusion energy program on national program elements that further the design, construction, and operation of the international thermonuclear experimental reactor and a future fusion demonstration reactor.

The Department is directed to set priorities for the domestic fusion program identifying those elements that contribute directly to the development of ITER or to the development of a fusion demonstration reactor. The Department will provide a plan that describes the selection process for the proposed site within the United States for ITER, the necessary steps that will lead to the final selection of a host site for ITER by the countries involved in the ITER program, and the schedule and critical path including milestones and budget that will be necessary to allow for the design, construction, and operation of ITER by 2005. Of the available funds, \$64,000,000 is included for ITER design and R&D. Within available funds, \$2,000,000 is provided to begin the evaluation and selection of a U.S. host site for ITER.

The deuterium-tritium experiments that will be conducted on the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR), located at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory (PPPL), are to have the highest priority within the U.S. fusion energy program during fiscal year 1994.

In support of ITER design and R&D tasks, and further development of a fusion demonstration reactor, \$20,000,000 is included for design work on the Tokamak Physics Experiment (TPX). The successful operation of both TPX and ITER is necessary for the development of an attractive fusion demonstration reactor. The TPX facility will be a national facility that takes advantage of the site credits at PPPL. The Department is directed to ensure that U.S. industry is fully involved in the design of TPX. Thus, it is the intent of the conferees for the TPX project to proceed with design activity including industrial participation in the engineering design and R&D. The Department should utilize standard, phased, industrial contracts for these design activities with options for construction that would permit continuity and would allow the project, if it should be approved in the future, to be completed in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

The Department is directed to proceed with the upgrade of the DIII-D Tokamak facility including increasing operating time to expedite the formulation of design solutions for TPX and ITER.

The conferees direct the Department to begin an aggressive low activation fusion materials program with the goal of developing and characterizing low activation materials that could be tested in ITER and utilized in a future demonstration power reactor.

The conferees agree with the House report language providing a \$500,000 increase, within available funds, for inertial fusion energy, and strongly urge the Department to maintain a viable inertial fusion energy program and move forward with a timely decision on the Inertial Linac Systems Experiment that would allow, if a favorable decision is rendered, construction to begin in fiscal year 1995.

#### SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The conferees support the continuation of the Advanced Neutron Source and the conference agreement provides \$17,000,000 for the project. This is the amount needed for the continuation of essential research and development, reactor safety and regulatory compliance tasks. This will include work on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, completion of advanced conceptual design studies and updates to the appropriate baseline documentation, and applicable activities to position the project to proceed. The con-

ferees expect a construction start next year upon accomplishment of this required work.

The conferees recommend \$3,000,000 for the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium as proposed by the House and the \$700,000 for a feasibility study to determine options for projects or programs to facilitate the adoption and long-term development of energy efficiency and renewable energy on Indian Reservations as proposed by the House.

The conferees are aware of the University of Nebraska's superconductivity research and urge the members of the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium to consider the inclusion of the institute.

The conferees recommend \$7,000,000 for the DOE Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DOE-EPSCoR) as recommended by the Senate.

The conferees are supportive of the work done at Florida State University's Super Computations Research Institute. The Department of Energy is urged to fully utilize the facility and give consideration toward providing assistance in updating and expanding the Institute's capabilities. Accordingly, from within available funds, the conferees' recommendation includes \$8,300,000 to continue the Super Computations Research Institute.

The conferees do not include funds for the House provisions relating to the Dade County public schools, and the provision relating to the Queens Hall of Science Discovery Laboratory.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (NON-DEFENSE)

The conferees have included funds to continue the Maywood site and Wayne site cleanup contained in the DOE Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). This will continue the removal of contaminated materials in interim storage at Maywood and Wayne, New Jersey.

#### URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that appropriates \$177,092,000 instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by the House and specifies specific funding and revenue sources for the Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities.

#### URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that the anticipated unobligated balances should be estimated rather than prescribed.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that specifies the amount of funds to be expended for uranium and thorium decontamination required by the Energy Policy Act of 1982.

In lieu of the Senate report language concerning the appropriation of funds for the initial reimbursements of claims made by active uranium and thorium mill site licensees for remediation expenses under title X, subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486), the conferees are in agreement that the Department is to carry out the program and use the funds in a fair and equitable manner consistent with Public Law 102-486.

#### GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$975,114,000, to remain available until expended, and, in addition, \$640,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be used only to orderly terminate the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) project under terms and conditions as follows:

(1) to the extent provided by guidelines of the Secretary of Energy, full-time employees of contractors and designated subcontractors whose employment is terminated by reason of the termination of the SSC may receive (A) up to 90 days termination pay dating from the date of termination notice, and (B) reasonable relocation expenses and assistance;

(2) the Secretary of Energy shall prepare and submit a report with recommendations to the President and the Congress containing:

(a) a plan to maximize the value of the investment that has been made in the project and minimizing the loss to the United States and involved states and persons, including recommendations as to the feasibility of utilizing SSC assets in whole or in part in pursuit of an international high energy physics endeavor;

(b) the Secretary is authorized to consult with and use Universities Research Association and/or other contractors and/or recognized experts in preparing this report and recommendations and is authorized to contract with such parties as may be appropriate in carrying out such duties; and

(c) the Secretary shall release any recommendations from time to time as available, but the final report shall be submitted by July 1, 1994; and

(3) nothing herein or any action taken under this authority shall be construed to change the Memorandum of Understanding between the Secretary of Energy and the State of Texas dated November 9, 1990, regarding the project, and on page 21, line 17, of the House engrossed bill (H.R. 2445) strike all after "\$1,194,114,000" down to and including "expended" on line 18.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Appropriates \$975,114,000 for General Science and Research Activities and, in addition, \$640,000,000 for the Superconducting Super Collider termination instead of \$1,194,114,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,615,114,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Secretary shall also submit to the President and the Congress a report and recommendations concerning plans for other large science projects within the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy.

This report shall include recommendations as to whether high energy physics and other large research projects and programs should continue to be pursued by the United States and, if so, for what purposes should they be pursued and how should they be funded and financed.

Amendment No. 34: Deletes language proposed by the House limiting the availability of funds to construct a B-Factor.

The conferees agree to provide \$36,000,000 for the construction of the asymmetric B-meson production facility (B-Factor) as proposed by the House. Since the review and selection of the site for the project have been completed, the restrictions contained in the House bill are no longer required.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed by the Senate restricting the availability of funds for the Superconducting Super Collider.

The Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility (LAMPF), the Relativistic Heavy Ion

Collider (RHIC), the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF) are funded as proposed by the Senate.

Because of budget limitations, the conferees recommend a general reduction of \$15,000,000.

Language in the Act would prohibit the expenditure of funds for "food, beverage, receptions, parties, country club fees, plants or flowers pursuant to any cost-reimbursable contract". The managers do not intend to preclude legitimate activities such as cafeteria services. It is intended to prohibit the waste of the taxpayers' money on payment of contractors' country club fees or fancy parties and receptions.

#### NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Amendment No. 36: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

For the nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$260,000,000 to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. To the extent that balances in the fund are not sufficient to cover amounts available for obligation in the account, the Secretary shall exercise her authority pursuant to section 302(e)(5) of said Act to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury: Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated, within available funds, not to exceed \$5,500,000 may be provided to the State of Nevada, for the sole purpose of conduct of its scientific oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97-425, as amended: Provided further, That of the amount herein appropriated, not more than \$7,000,000 may be provided to affected local governments, as defined in the Act, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act: Provided further, That within ninety days of the completion of each Federal fiscal year, each State or local entity shall provide certification to the Department of Energy, that all funds expended from such payments have been expended for activities as defined in Public Law 97-425, as amended. Failure to provide such certification shall cause such entity to be prohibited from any further funding provided for similar activities: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for any lobbying activity as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used for litigation expenses: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used to support multistate efforts or other coalition building activities inconsistent with the restrictions contained in this Act: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this Act shall be made available for Phase II-B grants to study the feasibility of siting a Monitored Retrievable Storage Facility.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees agree to the distribution of the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund as proposed by the Senate which makes specific allocations and restrictions as to the use of the funds. The provision proposed by the Senate considering the siting of a Monitored Retrievable Storage facility has been revised to prohibit Phase II-B grants.

The conferees agree with the House provisions concerning the development of a multipurpose canister (MPC).

#### ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$3,595,198,000 instead of \$3,572,198,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,597,482,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree to provide \$17,000,000 to continue funding the dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). However, no funds are provided for the high-explosives material test facility at LANL.

For the technology transfer program in fiscal year 1994, an amount of \$223,000,000 is recommended. Within this funding, the conferees support making available not to exceed \$3,000,000 for evaluating and assisting in the transfer of technologies developed at the Nevada Test Site.

The conference agreement includes \$10,000,000 for the high-performance computing and communications program.

The conferees are aware that the authorizing committees may include in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 a change to the testing program budget structure. There is no objection to the Department implementing this new structure in fiscal year 1994.

The conferees have not included \$4,000,000 proposed by the Senate to establish, in conjunction with the Department of Defense, a program for destruction of highly energetic explosives. There is no objection to the Department of Energy's participation in this program if funded on a reimbursable basis by another agency.

The conference agreement provides \$30,000,000 for the research and evaluation activities related to the production of tritium and to initiate a systematic review of all available options for disposal of plutonium from dismantled warheads. These funds have been provided as part of the weapons complex reconfiguration program which is currently managing this activity.

During deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees are addressing the issues of tritium production and plutonium disposal.

The conferees recognize the need to provide for new tritium production capacity to meet future anticipated demands for tritium in the downsized nuclear weapons stockpile as well as the need to provide a practical solution to the safeguarding and disposal of plutonium from dismantled nuclear weapons. Thus, the conference agreement supports the continuation of activities begun last year by the Department of Energy to evaluate the feasibility of tritium production along with disposition of plutonium and generation of electricity. In addition, the Department should consider developing a cooperative program with Russia to explore methods of plutonium disposal and power production.

The conferees believe that the Nation must immediately begin development of a plan for ultimate disposal of plutonium from dismantled warheads. The technical, institutional and economic issues of each alternative must be evaluated. The Department is directed to begin an analysis of the costs and benefits of each option for plutonium disposal including, but not limited to, indefinite storage, direct disposal in a repository, immobilization in a waste form, reactor or accelerator conversion of plutonium, and subsequent spent fuel handling and waste management costs for each option. The development times for each technology as well as health, safety, and environmental problems are to be addressed also.



## DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$5,181,855,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management instead of \$5,185,877,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,106,855,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees wish to reiterate concerns raised by both the House and Senate with respect to the overall cost of environmental cleanup actions that the Department has committed to perform under existing compliance agreements. While committed to providing adequate funding for necessary cleanup activities around the country, the conferees emphasize that there will not be an endless source of funding for this program with significant increases in the outyears.

The Department should begin to develop a program related to the management of hazardous materials and of hazardous materials emergency response, and up to \$10,000,000 from within available funds is provided for program planning and predesign activities in fiscal year 1994. The Department is expected to include funding for this activity in the fiscal year 1995 budget submission.

The conferees agree that the Department needs to develop a mechanism for establishing priorities among competing cleanup requirements. Toward this end, the Department is directed to review compliance agreements and to submit by June 30, 1995, a report to the Committees on Appropriations evaluating the risks to the public health and safety posed by the conditions at weapons complex facilities that are addressed by compliance agreement requirements.

The report should estimate, with as much specificity as practicable, the risk to the health and safety of individual members of the public intended to be addressed by cleanup activities required by the compliance agreements, the health and safety effect of implementing the requirements, and the cost associated with implementing the requirement. The Department should work with State and Federal regulators and affected parties to develop programs which reduce risk to public and worker health and safety.

The conferees emphasize that they do not intend the Department to perform an exhaustive, formal risk assessment, as that term is frequently used, of the thousands of cleanup activities required by the compli-

ance agreement. Instead, the Department is directed to estimate the risk addressed by cleanup requirements on the basis of the best scientific evidence available.

The conference agreement includes \$2,114,000 for the liquid waste treatment system at the Nevada Test Site consistent with the Department's amended budget request.

The conferees have provided \$40,000,000 for closeout activities for the Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant construction project at Richland, Washington, in accordance with the revised Hanford site cleanup agreement. An additional \$35,000,000 has been provided in waste management operating expenses to support the closeout activities and to begin implementation of new activities required by the revised Hanford site cleanup agreement. Also, in support of the revised agreement, \$45,660,000 has been provided for the multi-function waste remediation facility at the Hanford site to accelerate construction of new tanks and development of waste pretreatment capability.

The conferees have restored the \$10,000,000 reduction proposed by the Senate to the technology development program. However, the conferees support the Senate position that these funds should not be used for educational activities. These funds are to be used for development of innovative technologies related to the remediation of high-level waste tanks and the characterization, treatment, and disposal of mixed waste. The technology development program has increasingly included funds for educational activities, community agreements, and other activities not related to technology development. The Department should ensure that the technology development program is clearly defined and justified.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that provides for the transfer of \$8,000,000 to the Environmental Protection Agency for implementation of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act of 1992 and development of cleanup standards to guide the Department of Energy's environmental restoration efforts.

## MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$1,963,755,000 as proposed by the Senate in-

stead of \$2,046,592,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees understand the Secretary of Energy has developed a plan to revise significantly the Department's classification procedures. This plan will include a comprehensive review of the classification rules and procedures, research and development of new technology to expedite declassification of documents, expanded training of employees to declassify documents, and public participation. The conferees support the objectives of this plan and expect them to be accomplished within the funds provided including issuance of revised classification guidelines by September 30, 1994. The Department is directed to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by June 15, 1994, on the progress to date.

The conferees support the Department's ongoing program in Verification and Control Technology to establish a data base and tracking system for weapons grade plutonium, uranium, and tritium in the states of the former Soviet Union, and urge the department to accelerate the program as much as possible within available funds.

The conference agreement does not include establishment of a new program for tritium production and plutonium disposition. Tritium production activities which were initiated last year and development of plutonium disposition alternatives are included in the weapons complex reconfiguration program.

## OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$30,362,000 for the Office of the Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of \$31,757,000 as proposed by the House.

## POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

## WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$272,956,000 for the Western Area Power Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$287,956,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$260,400,000 to be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$275,400,000 as proposed by the House.



## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT</b>		
<b>I. Solar applications</b>		
<b>A. Solar building technology research</b>		
Operating expenses.....	4,807,000	4,807,000
Capital equipment.....	200,000	200,000
<b>Total, Solar building technology research.....</b>	<b>5,007,000</b>	<b>5,007,000</b>
<b>B. Photovoltaic energy systems</b>		
Operating expenses.....	71,345,000	74,345,000
Capital equipment.....	6,700,000	3,700,000
<b>Total, Photovoltaic energy systems.....</b>	<b>78,045,000</b>	<b>78,045,000</b>
<b>C. Solar thermal energy systems</b>		
Operating expenses.....	32,191,000	32,191,000
Capital equipment.....	509,000	509,000
<b>Total, Solar thermal energy systems.....</b>	<b>32,700,000</b>	<b>32,700,000</b>
<b>D. Biofuels energy systems</b>		
Operating expenses.....	55,057,000	55,057,000
Capital equipment.....	3,100,000	3,100,000
<b>Total, Biofuels energy systems.....</b>	<b>58,157,000</b>	<b>58,157,000</b>
<b>E. Wind energy systems</b>		
Operating expenses.....	26,453,000	26,453,000
Capital equipment.....	3,900,000	3,900,000
<b>Total, Wind energy systems.....</b>	<b>30,353,000</b>	<b>30,353,000</b>
<b>F. Ocean energy systems - OE.....</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>
<b>Total, Solar applications.....</b>	<b>204,262,000</b>	<b>205,262,000</b>
<b>II. Other solar energy</b>		
<b>A. International solar energy program - OE.....</b>	<b>5,754,000</b>	<b>5,250,000</b>
<b>B. Solar technology transfer - OE.....</b>	<b>16,404,000</b>	<b>21,404,000</b>
<b>C. National Renewable Energy Laboratory</b>		
Capital equipment.....	1,025,000	1,025,000
Construction:		
General plant projects.....	1,728,000	1,728,000
94-E-102 National wind technology center expansion, Golden, CO.....	3,180,000	3,180,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>4,908,000</b>	<b>4,908,000</b>
<b>Total, National Renewable Energy Laboratory.....</b>	<b>5,933,000</b>	<b>5,933,000</b>
<b>D. Resource assessment</b>		
Operating expenses.....	2,203,000	2,100,000
Capital equipment.....	200,000	200,000
<b>Total, Resource assessment.....</b>	<b>2,403,000</b>	<b>2,300,000</b>
<b>E. Solar program support - OE.....</b>	<b>5,400,000</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>
<b>F. Program direction - OE.....</b>	<b>8,200,000</b>	<b>7,200,000</b>
<b>Total, Other solar energy.....</b>	<b>44,094,000</b>	<b>47,087,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY.....</b>	<b>248,356,000</b>	<b>252,349,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(227,814,000)	(234,807,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(15,634,000)	(12,634,000)
(Construction.....)	(4,908,000)	(4,908,000)

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>GEO THERMAL</b>		
II. Geothermal technology development - OE.....	22,072,000	22,072,000
III. Program direction - OE.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
IV. Capital equipment.....	900,000	900,000
<b>TOTAL, GEO THERMAL.....</b>	<b>23,972,000</b>	<b>23,972,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(23,072,000)	(23,072,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(900,000)	(900,000)
<b>HYDROGEN RESEARCH</b>		
I. Operating expenses.....	4,900,000	10,000,000
<b>HYDROPOWER</b>		
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE.....	946,000	946,000
II. Program direction - OE.....	135,000	135,000
<b>TOTAL, HYDROPOWER.....</b>	<b>1,081,000</b>	<b>1,081,000</b>
<b>ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE</b>		
<b>I. Electric energy systems</b>		
A. Electric field effects research - OE.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
B. Reliability research - OE.....	6,100,000	6,100,000
C. System and materials research - OE.....	20,730,000	20,730,000
D. Program direction - OE.....	850,000	850,000
E. Capital equipment.....	900,000	900,000
<b>Total, Electric energy systems.....</b>	<b>38,580,000</b>	<b>38,580,000</b>
<b>II. Energy storage systems</b>		
A. Battery storage - OE.....	5,774,000	5,774,000
B. Thermal storage - OE.....	---	1,100,000
C. Superconducting magnetic energy storage.....	---	10,000,000
D. Program direction - OE.....	350,000	350,000
E. Capital equipment.....	300,000	300,000
<b>Total, Energy storage systems.....</b>	<b>6,424,000</b>	<b>17,524,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE.....</b>	<b>45,004,000</b>	<b>56,104,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(43,804,000)	(44,904,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(1,200,000)	(11,200,000)
<b>POLICY AND MANAGEMENT</b>		
Policy and management - CE.....	3,878,000	3,878,000
<b>NUCLEAR ENERGY</b>		
<b>I. Nuclear energy R &amp; D</b>		
A. Light water reactor - OE.....	57,789,000	57,789,000
B. Advanced reactor R & D		
Operating expenses.....	16,000,000	42,400,000
C. Space reactor power systems		
Operating expenses.....	27,500,000	27,500,000
D. Advanced radioisotope power system		
Operating expenses.....	46,100,000	46,100,000
Capital equipment.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
<b>Total, Advanced radioisotope power system.....</b>	<b>48,100,000</b>	<b>48,100,000</b>
F. Facilities		
Operating expenses.....	6,900,000	6,900,000
G. Program direction.....	10,463,000	10,463,000
H. Policy and management		
Operating expenses.....	12,612,000	12,612,000
I. Test reactor area hot cells.....	1,400,000	1,400,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
J. Oak Ridge landlord		
Operating expenses.....	16,080,000	16,080,000
Capital equipment.....	670,000	670,000
Construction:		
GPN-103 General plant projects.....	1,450,000	1,450,000
94-E-201 Communications network, OR.....	6,700,000	6,700,000
Total, construction.....	8,150,000	8,150,000
Total, Oak Ridge landlord.....	24,900,000	24,900,000
Total, Nuclear energy R & D.....	205,664,000	232,064,000
(Operating expenses).....	(194,844,000)	(221,244,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(2,670,000)	(2,670,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(8,150,000)	(8,150,000)
II. Termination costs		
Operating expenses.....	102,300,000	102,300,000
Capital equipment.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Construction:		
GPN-102 General plant projects.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, Termination costs.....	109,300,000	109,300,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY.....	314,964,000	341,364,000
(Operating expenses).....	(297,144,000)	(323,544,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(7,670,000)	(7,670,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(10,150,000)	(10,150,000)
CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
I. Spent fuel storage R&D - OE.....	577,000	577,000
II. Program direction - OE.....	110,000	110,000
TOTAL, CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	687,000	687,000
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Operating expenses.....	173,246,000	158,070,000
Capital equipment.....	1,600,000	1,600,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH.....	174,846,000	159,670,000
NUCLEAR SAFETY POLICY - OE.....	15,000,000	15,000,000
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS.SPILL TEST FACILITY - ESRD.....	979,000	1,300,000
ENERGY RESEARCH		
I. Biological and environmental research		
A. Biological and environmental research R&D		
Operating expenses.....	338,060,000	338,060,000
Capital equipment.....	21,600,000	21,600,000
Construction:		
GP-E-120.General plant projects.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
94-E-335 Brookhaven linac isotope producer.facility upgrade,.BNL.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
94-E-337 Advanced light source structural biology support facility, LBL.....	600,000	600,000
94-E-338.Structural biology center, ANL.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
94-E-339.Human genome lab,.LBL.....	2,200,000	2,200,000



## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
91-EM-100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA.....	33,000,000	33,000,000
Total, Construction.....	49,300,000	49,300,000
Total, Biological and environmental research R&D..	408,960,000	408,960,000
B. BER program direction - OE.....	7,100,000	7,100,000
Total, Biological and environmental research.....	416,060,000	416,060,000
(Operating expenses).....	(345,160,000)	(345,160,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(21,600,000)	(21,600,000)
(Construction.....)	(49,300,000)	(49,300,000)
II. Fusion energy		
A. Confinement systems.....	157,400,000	170,400,000
B. Development and technology.....	81,300,000	81,300,000
C. Applied plasma physics.....	59,805,000	59,805,000
D. Planning and projects.....	4,895,000	4,895,000
E. Inertial fusion energy.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
F. Program direction - OE.....	9,200,000	9,200,000
G. Capital equipment.....	15,995,000	15,995,000
H. Construction:		
GPE-900 General plant projects, var. locations.	2,000,000	2,000,000
94-E-200 Tokamak physics experiment, Princeton plasma physics laboratory.....	13,000,000	---
Total, Construction.....	15,000,000	2,000,000
Total, Fusion energy.....	347,595,000	347,595,000
(Operating expenses).....	(316,600,000)	(329,600,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(15,995,000)	(15,995,000)
(Construction.....)	(15,000,000)	(2,000,000)
III. Supporting research and technical analysis		
A. Basic energy sciences		
1. Materials sciences.....	276,985,000	276,985,000
2. Chemical sciences.....	169,000,000	169,000,000
3. Applied mathematical sciences.....	106,200,000	106,200,000
4. Engineering and geosciences.....	37,900,000	37,900,000
5. Advanced energy projects.....	11,400,000	11,400,000
6. Energy biosciences.....	26,700,000	26,700,000
7. Program direction - OE.....	9,400,000	9,400,000
8. Capital equipment.....	44,880,000	44,880,000
9. Construction:		
GPE-400 General plant projects.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
94-E-305 Accelerator & reactor improvements.	7,500,000	7,500,000
89-R-402 6-7 GeV syn. radiation source, ANL.	107,000,000	107,000,000
Total, Construction.....	119,500,000	119,500,000
Total, Basic energy sciences.....	801,965,000	801,965,000
(Operating expenses).....	(637,585,000)	(637,585,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(44,880,000)	(44,880,000)
(Construction.....)	(119,500,000)	(119,500,000)
B. Advanced neutron source		
Operating expenses.....	12,000,000	17,000,000
Capital equipment.....	1,000,000	---
Construction:		
94-E-308 Advanced neutron source.....	26,000,000	---
Total, Advanced neutron source.....	39,000,000	17,000,000
C. Energy oversight, res. analysis & univ. support		
1. Energy research analyses - OE.....	4,020,000	4,020,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
2. University & science education programs		
a. Laboratory cooperative science centers...	35,823,000	35,823,000
b. University programs.....	12,800,000	12,800,000
c. University reactor fuel assistance.....	- 3,730,000	3,730,000
d. University research instrumentation.....	5,647,000	5,647,000
Total, University & science education programs.	58,000,000	58,000,000
3. ER laboratory technology transfer.....	39,353,000	39,353,000
4. Advisory and oversight - OE.....	13,800,000	13,800,000
Total, Energy oversight, res. anal. & univ. supt..	115,173,000	115,173,000
D. Multiprogram energy labs - facility support		
1. Multiprogram general purpose facilities		
Operating expenses.....	700,000	700,000
Capital equipment.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
Construction:		
GPE-801 General plant projects.....	9,000,000	9,000,000
94-E-351 Fuel storage and transfer facility (BNL).....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-E-363 Replace roofing, (ORNL).....	3,300,000	3,300,000
93-E-313 Electrical system upgrade, phase.II (ANL).....	2,150,000	2,150,000
93-E-325 Potable water system upgrade, phase.I (BNL).....	2,017,000	2,017,000
92-E-322 East canyon electrical safety project (LBL).....	1,568,000	1,568,000
92-E-323 Upgrade steam distribution system, West End (ORNL).....	2,693,000	2,693,000
92-E-324 Safety compliance modifications, 326 building (PNL).....	2,000,000	2,000,000
92-E-329 Electrical substation upgrade (ANL).....	2,070,000	2,070,000
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project (LBL).....	1,691,000	1,691,000
Total, Construction.....	27,489,000	27,489,000
Total, Multiprogram general purpose facilities.	34,189,000	34,189,000
2. Multiprogram energy labs - tiger team report		
Operating expenses.....	623,000	623,000
Capital equipment.....	500,000	500,000
Construction:		
93-E-315 Roof replacement, phase I (BNL)..	1,926,000	1,926,000
93-E-317 Life safety code compliance (PNL)	1,000,000	1,000,000
93-E-320 Fire and safety improvements, phase.II (ANL).....	850,000	850,000
93-E-323 Fire and safety systems upgrade, phase.I (LBL).....	1,000,000	1,000,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
93-E-324 Hazardous materials safeguards, phase I (LBL).....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, Construction.....	5,776,000	5,776,000
Total, Tiger team report.....	6,899,000	6,899,000
Inactive and surplus facilities - OE.....	500,000	500,000
Total, Multiprogram energy laboratories - fac sup. (Operating expenses).....	41,588,000	41,588,000
(Capital equipment).....	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)
(Construction).....	(6,500,000)	(6,500,000)
	(33,265,000)	(33,265,000)
Total, Supporting research and technical analysis.....	997,726,000	975,726,000
(Operating expenses).....	(766,581,000)	(771,581,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(52,380,000)	(51,380,000)
(Construction).....	(178,765,000)	(152,765,000)
IV. Policy and management.....	3,233,000	3,233,000
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH.....	1,764,614,000	1,742,614,000
ENERGY APPLICATIONS		
I. Technical information management program		
Operating expenses.....	14,338,000	14,338,000
Capital equipment.....	600,000	600,000
Total, Technical information management program.....	14,938,000	14,938,000
II. In-house energy management		
Operating expenses.....	6,590,000	6,590,000
Construction:		
IHE - 500 Modifications for energy mgmt.....	19,555,000	19,555,000
Total, In-house energy management.....	26,145,000	26,145,000
TOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS.....	41,083,000	41,083,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)		
I. Corrective activities		
Operating expenses		
Undistributed.....	1,120,000	1,120,000
Construction:		
92-E-601 Melton Valley LLLW collection and transfer system upgrade (ORNL).....	11,500,000	11,500,000
90-R-119 Laboratory wastewater treatment plant improvements (ANL).....	680,000	680,000
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade (ORNL).....	6,500,000	6,500,000
Total, Construction.....	18,680,000	18,680,000
Total, Corrective activities.....	19,800,000	19,800,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,120,000)	(1,120,000)
(Construction).....	(18,680,000)	(18,680,000)
II. Environmental restoration		
Operating expenses:		
1. Facilities and sites.....	230,858,000	230,858,000
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects.....	42,745,000	42,745,000



## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects.....	97,103,000	97,103,000
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
Total, Environmental restoration.....	377,706,000	377,706,000
(Operating expenses).....	(377,706,000)	(377,706,000)
III. Waste management		
Operating expenses:		
1. Waste operations.....	73,336,000	73,336,000
2. West valley.....	124,000,000	124,000,000
3. Low level waste.....	11,400,000	11,400,000
Total, Operating expenses.....	208,736,000	208,736,000
Capital equipment.....	2,706,000	2,706,000
Construction:		
GP-E-600 General plant projects.....	1,992,000	1,992,000
94-E-601 Waste handling building, Fermilab.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-E-602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL.....	3,600,000	3,600,000
93-E-632 Laboratory floor drain collection system upgrades, BNL.....	1,083,000	1,083,000
93-E-633 Upgrade sanitary sewer system (ORNL)..	7,000,000	7,000,000
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL.	7,320,000	7,320,000
91-E-305 Waste management fac. project (BNL)...	6,150,000	6,150,000
91-E-322 329 Building compliance (PNL).....	1,800,000	1,800,000
91-E-600 Rehab of waste management bld 306, ANL	200,000	200,000
91-E-602 Hazardous, radioactive and mixed waste storage facility.(ANL).....	1,295,000	1,295,000
88-R-112 Hazardous waste handling, fac. (LBL)..	5,787,000	5,787,000
Total, Construction.....	37,227,000	37,227,000
Total, Waste management.....	248,669,000	248,669,000
(Operating expenses).....	(208,736,000)	(208,736,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(2,706,000)	(2,706,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(37,227,000)	(37,227,000)
IV. Facility transition and management		
Operating expenses.....	71,103,000	71,103,000
Capital equipment.....	200,000	200,000
Total, Facility transition and management.....	71,303,000	71,303,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT.	717,478,000	717,478,000
(Operating expenses).....	(658,665,000)	(658,665,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(2,906,000)	(2,906,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(55,907,000)	(55,907,000)
Subtotal, Energy supply research and development.....	3,356,842,000	3,366,580,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-113,300,000	-113,300,000
Education programs (ESR&D).....	-58,000,000	---
Salary reduction.....	-29,370,000	-29,370,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	3,156,172,000	3,223,910,000
(Operating expenses).....	(2,702,102,000)	(2,802,840,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(120,485,000)	(126,485,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(333,585,000)	(294,585,000)

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
--	--------------------	------------

## URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

## I. Uranium enrichment residual activities

Operating expenses.....	246,992,000	246,992,000
Capital equipment.....	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Uranium supply and enrichment activities....	247,092,000	247,092,000
(Operating expenses).....	(246,992,000)	(246,992,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(100,000)	(100,000)
Revenues.....	-70,000,000	-70,000,000
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES.....	177,092,000	177,092,000
(Operating expenses).....	(176,992,000)	(176,992,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(100,000)	(100,000)

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND  
DECOMMISSIONING FUND

UE Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.....	286,320,000	286,320,000
--	-------------	-------------

## GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

## I. High energy physics

A. Physics research - OE.....	148,560,000	148,560,000
B. Facility operations		
Operating expenses.....	268,455,000	268,455,000
Capital equipment.....	61,160,000	61,160,000
Construction:		
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations.....	12,149,000	12,149,000
94-G-301 Accelerator improvements & modifications, VL.....	13,105,000	13,105,000
94-G-304.B-Factory.....	36,000,000	36,000,000
92-G-302.Fermilab main injector, Fermilab....	25,000,000	25,000,000
Total, Construction.....	86,254,000	86,254,000
Total, Facility operations.....	415,869,000	415,869,000
C. High energy technology - OE.....	59,415,000	59,415,000
E. Other capital equipment.....	3,925,000	3,925,000
Total, High energy physics.....	627,769,000	627,769,000
(Operating expenses).....	(476,430,000)	(476,430,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(65,085,000)	(65,085,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(86,254,000)	(86,254,000)

## II. Nuclear physics

A. Medium energy physics - OE.....	91,555,000	111,555,000
B. Heavy ion physics - OE.....	67,400,000	67,400,000
C. Low energy physics - OE.....	25,600,000	25,600,000
D. Nuclear theory - OE.....	14,800,000	14,800,000
E. Capital equipment.....	27,130,000	30,130,000
F. Construction:		
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations.....	3,600,000	3,600,000
94-G-302 Accelerator improvements & mods., VL..	3,800,000	3,800,000
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL..	70,000,000	78,000,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA.....	16,590,000	16,590,000
Total, Construction.....	93,990,000	101,990,000
G. Other capital equipment.....	1,870,000	1,870,000
Total, Nuclear physics.....	322,345,000	353,345,000
(Operating expenses).....	(199,355,000)	(219,355,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(29,000,000)	(32,000,000)
(Construction.....)	(93,990,000)	(101,990,000)
III. General science program direction - OE.....	9,000,000	9,000,000
IV. Superconducting super collider		
A. SSC project		
Operating expenses.....	104,402,000	---
Capital equipment.....	50,000,000	---
Construction:		
90-R-106. Superconducting super collider.....	480,598,000	---
Total, SSC project.....	635,000,000	---
B. SSC laboratory research and operations		
Operating expenses.....	5,000,000	---
C. Termination costs.....	---	640,000,000
Total, Superconducting super collider.....	640,000,000	640,000,000
General reduction.....	-12,923,000	-15,000,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	1,586,191,000	1,615,114,000
(Operating expenses).....	(781,264,000)	(1,329,785,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(144,085,000)	(97,085,000)
(Construction.....)	(660,842,000)	(188,244,000)
=====		
ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND		
I. Isotope production.....	3,910,000	3,910,000
General reduction.....	-44,000	---
TOTAL, ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND	3,866,000	3,910,000
=====		
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES:		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
I. Research and development		
A. Research and development - core		
Operating expenses.....	986,772,000	956,772,000
Capital equipment.....	67,019,000	67,019,000
Construction:		
GPD-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	11,500,000	11,500,000
94-D-102, Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations....	11,110,000	4,000,000
92-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, phase IV, various locations...	27,479,000	27,479,000
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, develop- ment, and testing facilities revitalization, phase III, various locations.....	30,805,000	30,805,000



## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, develop- ment, and testing facilities revitalization, phase II, various locations.....	39,624,000	39,624,000
Total, Construction.....	120,518,000	113,408,000
Total, Research and development - core.....	1,174,309,000	1,137,199,000
B. Inertial fusion		
Operating expenses.....	172,553,000	172,553,000
Capital equipment.....	15,860,000	15,860,000
Total, Inertial fusion.....	188,413,000	188,413,000
Total, Research and development.....	1,362,722,000	1,325,612,000
II. Testing		
A. Weapons program		
Operating expenses.....	375,000,000	374,726,000
Capital equipment.....	24,400,000	19,400,000
Construction:		
GPD-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
93-D-102 Nevada support facility, North Las Vegas, NV.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
Total, Construction.....	9,000,000	9,000,000
Total, Testing.....	408,400,000	403,126,000
Total, Research, development and testing.....	1,771,122,000	1,728,738,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,534,325,000)	(1,504,051,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(107,279,000)	(102,279,000)
(Construction.....)	(129,518,000)	(122,408,000)
III. Stockpile support		
Operating expenses.....	1,802,280,000	1,792,280,000
Capital equipment.....	12,136,000	12,136,000
Construction:		
Production base:		
Facilities capability assurance program: 88-D-122 Facilities capabilities assurance program (FCAP), various locations.....	27,100,000	27,100,000
Production support facilities: GPD-121 General plant projects, various locations.....	7,700,000	7,700,000
Total, Production base.....	34,800,000	34,800,000
Environment, safety and health:		
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-D-128 Environmental, Safety and Health analytical lab, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX...	800,000	800,000
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
92-D-126 Replace emergency notification systems, various locations.....	10,500,000	10,500,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control Y-12 plant.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total, Environment, safety and health.....	26,300,000	26,300,000
Safeguards and security: 88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
Total, Construction.....	81,100,000	81,100,000
Use of prior year balances - OE (WA/SS).....	---	-3,000,000
Total, Stockpile support.....	1,895,516,000	1,882,516,000
IV. Program direction		
Weapons program direction.....	280,466,000	177,466,000
Contractor employment transition.....	---	100,000,000
Capital equipment.....	3,619,000	3,619,000
Total, Program direction.....	284,085,000	281,085,000
V. Complex reconfiguration		
Operating expenses.....	138,500,000	168,500,000
Construction: 93-D-123 Complex - 21, various locations.....	25,000,000	25,000,000
Total, Complex reconfiguration.....	163,500,000	193,500,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities.....	4,114,223,000	4,085,839,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-356,641,000	-440,641,000
Salary reduction.....	-48,282,000	-50,000,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES.....	3,709,300,000	3,595,198,000
(Operating expenses).....	(3,350,648,000)	(3,248,656,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(123,034,000)	(118,034,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(235,618,000)	(228,508,000)
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT		
I. Corrective activities		
Operating expenses		
Undesignated.....	2,170,000	2,170,000
Capital equipment		
Undesignated.....	600,000	600,000
Construction: 92-D-403 Tank upgrades project, LLNL.....	3,888,000	3,888,000
Total, Corrective activities.....	6,658,000	6,658,000
(Operating expenses).....	(2,170,000)	(2,170,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(600,000)	(600,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(3,888,000)	(3,888,000)
II. Environmental restoration		
Operating expenses.....	1,536,027,000	1,536,027,000
III. Waste management		
Operating expenses.....	2,327,106,000	2,362,106,000
Capital equipment.....	132,113,000	138,781,000
Construction: GP-D-171 General plant projects.....	28,959,000	28,959,000
94-D-400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-D-402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS.....	2,114,000	2,114,000
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL.....	9,400,000	9,400,000
94-D-405 Central neutralization facility pipeline extension project, K-25.....	1,714,000	1,714,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
94-D-406 Low-level waste disposal facilities, K-25.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, RL.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
94-D-408 Office facilities - 200 East, RL.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
94-D-411 Solid waste operation complex, RL.....	7,100,000	7,100,000
94-D-414 Site 300 explosive waste storage facility, LLNL.....	370,000	370,000
94-D-416 Solvent storage tanks installation, SR.	1,500,000	1,500,000
93-D-174 Plant drain waste water treatment upgrades, Y-12.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
93-D-175 Industrial waste compact fac., Y-12....	1,800,000	1,800,000
93-D-176 Oak Ridge reservation storage facility, Oak Ridge, TN.....	6,039,000	6,039,000
93-D-177 Disposal of K-1515 sanitary water treatment plant waste, K-25.....	7,100,000	7,100,000
93-D-178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, RF.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
93-D-181 Radioactive liquid waste line repl, RL.	6,700,000	6,000,000
93-D-182 Replace of cross-site trans system, RL.	6,500,000	6,500,000
93-D-183 Multi-function waste remediation, RL...	35,660,000	45,660,000
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, SR.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
93-D-188 New sanitary landfill, SR.....	1,020,000	1,020,000
92-D-172 Hazardous waste treatment and processing facility, Pantex Plant.....	300,000	300,000
92-D-173 NOx abatement facility, ID.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
92-D-177 Tank 101-AZ waste retrieval system, RL.	7,000,000	7,000,000
92-D-188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations.....	8,568,000	8,568,000
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA.....	17,700,000	17,700,000
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA.....	5,600,000	5,000,000
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID.....	21,700,000	21,700,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA.....	11,700,000	11,700,000
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA.....	1,800,000	1,000,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC.....	12,974,000	12,974,000
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA.....	85,000,000	40,000,000
87-D-181 Diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, SC.....	2,137,000	2,137,000
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA.....	10,260,000	10,260,000



## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC.....	2,169,000	2,169,000
81-T-105 Defense waste processing fac., SR, SC..	43,873,000	43,873,000
Total, Construction.....	379,457,000	342,357,000
Total, Waste management.....	2,838,676,000	2,843,244,000
(Operating expenses).....	(2,327,106,000)	(2,362,106,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(132,113,000)	(138,781,000)
(Construction.....)	(379,457,000)	(342,357,000)
IV. Technology development		
Operating expenses.....	371,150,000	371,150,000
Capital equipment.....	29,850,000	29,850,000
Total, Technology development.....	401,000,000	401,000,000
V. Transportation Management		
Operating expenses.....	19,730,000	19,730,000
Capital equipment.....	400,000	400,000
Total, Transportation Management.....	20,130,000	20,130,000
VI. Program direction		
Operating expenses.....	82,427,000	82,427,000
Capital equipment.....	9,469,000	9,469,000
Total, Program direction.....	91,896,000	91,896,000
VII. Facility transition & management		
Operating expenses.....	545,268,000	545,268,000
Capital equipment.....	24,726,000	24,726,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects, var. locations	19,221,000	19,221,000
94-D-122 Underground storage tanks, RF.....	700,000	700,000
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	1,190,000	600,000
94-D-412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, Washington.....	1,100,000	1,100,000
94-D-415 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory medical facilities, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	1,110,000	1,110,000
94-D-451 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado.....	6,600,000	6,600,000
93-D-172 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory electrical upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	9,600,000	9,600,000
93-D-184 325 facility compliance/renovation, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
93-D-185 Landlord program safety compliance, phase II, Richland, Washington.....	1,351,000	1,351,000
92-D-125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado.....	3,900,000	3,900,000
92-D-181 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	5,000,000	5,000,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
92-D-182 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory sewer systems upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	1,450,000	1,450,000
92-D-183 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory transportation complex, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	7,198,000	7,198,000
92-D-184 Hanford infrastructure underground storage tanks, Richland, Washington.....	300,000	300,000
92-D-186 Steam system rehabilitation, phase II, Richland, Washington.....	4,300,000	4,300,000
92-D-187 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase II, Richland, Washington.....	10,276,000	10,276,000
91-D-175 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase I, Richland, Washington.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance, phase I, Richland, Washington.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
Total, Construction.....	80,096,000	79,506,000
Total, Facility transition & management.....	650,090,000	649,500,000
(Operating expenses).....	(545,268,000)	(545,268,000)
(Capital expenses).....	(24,726,000)	(24,726,000)
(Construction).....	(80,096,000)	(79,506,000)
Subtotal, Defense environment restoration & waste mgmt	5,544,477,000	5,548,455,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-86,600,000	-86,600,000
General reduction and other adjustments.....	-37,765,000	-280,000,000
Transfer to EPA.....	8,000,000	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MGMT.	5,428,112,000	5,181,855,000
(Operating expenses).....	(4,767,513,000)	(4,552,278,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(197,158,000)	(203,826,000)
(Construction).....	(463,441,000)	(425,751,000)
MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS		
MATERIALS SUPPORT		
I. Reactor operations.....	168,495,000	168,495,000
II. Processing of nuclear materials.....	387,628,000	387,628,000
III. Supporting services.....	282,073,000	260,000,000
IV. Capital equipment.....	75,209,000	65,000,000
V. Construction:		
A. Environment, safety and health:		
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade Phase I & II, Savannah River, SC.....	7,720,000	7,720,000
93-D-148 Replace high-level drain lines, Savannah River, SC.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
93-D-152 Environmental modification for production facilities, Savannah River, SC.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC.....	15,000,000	15,000,000
92-D-142 Nuclear material processing training center, Savannah River, SC.....	8,900,000	8,900,000
92-D-143 Health protection instrument calibration facility, Savannah River, SC.....	9,600,000	9,600,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, Phases I and II, Savannah River, SC.....	25,950,000	25,950,000
Total, Environment, safety and health.....	88,970,000	88,970,000
B. Programmatic projects:		
GPD-146 General plant projects, various locations.....	31,760,000	23,000,000
92-D-150 Operations support facilities, Savannah River, SC.....	26,900,000	26,900,000
92-D-153 Engineering support facility, Savannah River Site, SC.....	9,500,000	9,500,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phases I, II, III, IV, V, and VI, various locations.....	3,700,000	3,700,000
Total, Programmatic projects.....	71,860,000	63,100,000
Total, Construction.....	160,830,000	152,070,000
VI. Program direction.....	62,970,000	57,000,000
Subtotal, Materials Support.....	1,137,205,000	1,090,193,000
TOTAL, MATERIALS SUPPORT.....	1,137,205,000	1,090,193,000
(Operating expenses).....	(901,166,000)	(873,123,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(75,209,000)	(65,000,000)
(Construction.....)	(160,830,000)	(152,070,000)
OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS		
I. Verification and control technology		
Operating expenses.....	344,741,000	341,941,000
Capital equipment.....	15,573,000	15,573,000
Construction:		
90-D-186 Center for national security and arms control, Sandia National Laboratories Albuquerque, NM.....	8,515,000	8,515,000
Total, Verification and control technology.....	368,829,000	366,029,000
II. Nuclear safeguards and security		
Operating expenses.....	86,246,000	82,700,000
Capital equipment.....	4,101,000	4,101,000
Total, Nuclear safeguards and security.....	90,347,000	86,801,000
III. Security investigations - OE.....	53,335,000	49,000,000
IV. Security evaluations		
Operating expenses.....	14,961,000	14,961,000
V. Office of nuclear safety		
Operating expenses.....	24,859,000	24,859,000
Capital equipment.....	50,000	50,000
Total, Office of nuclear safety.....	24,909,000	24,909,000
VI. Worker training and adjustment.....	100,000,000	100,000,000
TOTAL, OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.....	652,381,000	641,700,000
(Operating expenses).....	(624,142,000)	(613,461,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(19,724,000)	(19,724,000)
(Construction.....)	(8,515,000)	(8,515,000)



## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>NAVAL REACTORS</b>		
I. Naval reactors development		
A. Plant development - OE.....	124,900,000	124,900,000
B. Reactor development - OE.....	316,531,000	316,531,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation - OE.....	166,000,000	166,000,000
D. Capital equipment.....	46,900,000	46,900,000
E. Construction:		
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	7,500,000	7,500,000
93-D-200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY...	7,000,000	7,000,000
92-D-200 Laboratories facilities upgrades, various locations.....	2,800,000	2,800,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID.....	7,800,000	---
Total, Construction.....	25,100,000	17,300,000
F. Program direction.....	18,300,000	18,300,000
Total, Naval reactors development.....	697,731,000	689,931,000
II. Enrichment materials - OE.....	70,000,000	70,000,000
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS.....	767,731,000	759,931,000
(Operating expenses).....	(695,731,000)	(695,731,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(46,900,000)	(46,900,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(25,100,000)	(17,300,000)
SUBTOTAL, MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEF. PROGRAMS...	2,557,317,000	2,491,824,000
Savannah river pension refund.....	-100,000,000	-100,000,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-351,132,000	-409,132,000
Salary reduction.....	-18,937,000	-18,937,000
Education programs (MS).....	58,000,000	---
TOTAL, MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS...	2,145,248,000	1,963,755,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,808,970,000)	(1,654,246,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(141,833,000)	(131,624,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(194,445,000)	(177,885,000)
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	120,000,000	120,000,000
General reduction.....	-258,000	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL.....	119,742,000	120,000,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....	11,402,402,000	10,860,808,000
(Operating expenses).....	(10,046,873,000)	(9,575,180,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(462,025,000)	(453,484,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(893,504,000)	(832,144,000)
<b>DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION</b>		
I. Administrative operations		
A. Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses.	2,856,000	2,856,000
B. General management - personnel compensation and benefits.....	191,269,000	191,269,000
C. General management - other expenses		
1. Travel.....	5,317,000	5,317,000
2. Services.....	183,678,000	177,000,000
3. Capital equipment.....	8,561,000	7,780,000
Total, Other expenses.....	197,556,000	190,097,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
D. Program support		
1. Office of minority economic impact.....	3,626,000	3,626,000
2. Policy analysis and system studies.....	4,334,000	4,334,000
3. Consumer affairs.....	47,000	47,000
4. Public affairs.....	55,000	55,000
5. International policy studies.....	1,255,000	1,255,000
Total, Program support.....	9,317,000	9,317,000
Total, Administrative operations.....	400,998,000	393,539,000
II. Cost of work for others.....	61,626,000	61,626,000
Subtotal, Departmental administration (gross).....	462,624,000	455,165,000
Use of unobligated balances and other adjustments.....	-47,927,000	-53,927,000
General reduction.....	-214,000	---
Total, Departmental administration (gross).....	414,483,000	401,238,000
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-239,209,000	-239,209,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net).....	175,274,000	162,029,000
(Operating expenses).....	(166,713,000)	(154,249,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(8,561,000)	(7,780,000)
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General.....	31,757,000	30,362,000
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS:		
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
Operating expenses.....	4,010,000	4,010,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Operating expenses.....	3,217,000	3,217,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling.....	31,488,000	31,488,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	34,705,000	34,705,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-4,963,000	-4,963,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	29,742,000	29,742,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Operating expenses.....	21,563,000	21,563,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling.....	1,650,000	1,650,000
C. Construction.....	11,138,000	11,138,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	34,351,000	34,351,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-764,000	-764,000
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	33,587,000	33,587,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Construction and rehabilitation.....	121,695,000	121,695,000
B. System operation and maintenance.....	125,554,000	125,554,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling.....	100,707,000	100,707,000
D. Utah mitigation and conservation.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	352,956,000	352,956,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
--	--------------------	------------

Use of prior year balances.....	---	-75,000,000
Transfer of permanent authority from DOI.....	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)

TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	352,956,000	277,956,000
---	-------------	-------------

## FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Federal energy regulatory commission.....	165,375,000	165,375,000
FERC revenues.....	-165,375,000	-165,375,000

TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION.....	---	---
--	-----	-----

## NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Nuclear waste disposal fund.....	260,000,000	260,000,000
General reduction.....	-1,972,000	---

TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND.....	258,028,000	260,000,000
---	-------------	-------------



# TITLE IV INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

## APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$249,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$189,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agree that a total of \$50,000,000 is provided for Corridor L in West Virginia; a total of \$4,600,000 is provided for corridor construction in Mississippi; a total of \$13,500,000 is provided for Corridors G, B, Q, and F in Kentucky; and a total of \$38,700,000 is provided for corridor construction in Alabama.

## DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$16,560,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board instead of \$15,060,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,060,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$140,473,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$138,973,000 as proposed by the House.

# TITLE V

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 47: Deletes language proposed by the Senate urging the Secretary of Energy to prepare a proposal to satisfy the Bonneville Power Administration's entire repayment obligation to the United States Treasury.

The conferees agree that, utilizing funds made available in this Act, the Secretary of Energy is requested to submit to the Congress by February 1, 1994, a legislative proposal to satisfy the Bonneville Power Administration's entire repayment obligation to the United States Treasury for appropriated investment in the Federal Columbia River Power System. The proposal should result in maximum deficit reduction for the Federal Government in fiscal year 1995 through fiscal year 1999, and should not increase Bonneville Power Administration rates beyond those rates which would result under existing debt repayment policy and practices.

## CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1994 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1993 amount, the 1994 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1994 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	\$22,240,643,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	22,346,046,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	21,730,444,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	22,192,617,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1994 .....	22,215,382,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	- 25,261,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	- 130,664,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	+484,938,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	+22,765,000

TOM BEVILL,  
VIC FAZIO,  
JIM CHAPMAN,  
DOUGLAS "PETE"  
PETERSON,

ED PASTOR,  
CARRIE MEEK,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
JOHN T. MYERS,  
DEAN A. GALLO,  
HAROLD ROGERS,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
FRITZ HOLLINGS,  
JIM SASSER,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
HARRY REID,  
BOB KERREY,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
THAD COCHRAN,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
DON NICKLES,  
SLADE GORTON,  
MITCH MCCONNELL,

*Manager on the Part of the Senate.*

# COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

*Washington, DC, October 22, 1993.*

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY,

*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Thursday, October 21, 1993 at 5:10 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the extension of the agreement between the U.S.A. and Poland which constitute a governing international fishery agreement (GIFA) under the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976.

With great respect, I am  
Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,  
*Clerk, House of Representatives.*

# EXTENSION OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND POLAND CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE UNITED STATES COASTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-154)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

## *To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-265; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Poland Extending the Agreement of August 1, 1985, Concerning Fisheries off the

Coasts of the United States. The agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Washington June 8 and July 29, 1993, extends the 1985 agreement for an additional 2 years, from December 31, 1993, to December 31, 1995. The exchange of notes together with the 1985 agreement constitute a governing international fishery agreement within the requirements of section 201(c) of the Act.

I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 21, 1993.

# REFORM WEEK "NEXT WEEK"

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the majority leadership's promise that reform week will be "next week" reminds me of a roadside restaurant years ago in Sanibel, FL. After a long and dusty drive, my interest picked up when I saw a sign out front that said "free beer, tomorrow." So I went back the next day for a free beer—only to discover the sign was still there—in fact, it stayed there for many years, always promising free beer tomorrow, but never delivering today. It is a great marketing device, but it was limited value. Eventually visitors catch on and stop coming back. So the Democrat leadership should be careful about stringing along the American people, who are thirsty for real reform in the way Congress works. As long as reform week is slated for next week, we will never get there—but then again, maybe that is exactly what the majority leadership has in mind.

Now I understand the leadership has declared next month will be reform month. I wonder, when we come back, if reform year is going to be next year.

# U.S. CAPITOL ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that each of us in Congress and all Americans take a moment to remember the historical significance of this weekend. It was 200 years ago on September 18, 1793, that our first President, George Washington, came to what was then called Jenkins Hill. He came to lay the cornerstone to this magnificent structure—our U.S. Capitol.

Since that simple ceremony and most likely through the ages, no other building on Earth has more greatly symbolized mankind's quest for freedom and democracy. No other structure in the world is more easily recognized. And no

other building in America better reflects the great history of our Nation.

As we debate the important issues of our day we should not fail to recognize the most significant deeds of our past. While our Capitol Building was originally constructed with stone, brick, and mortar, it has been reinforced by the hopes, dreams, and wisdom of each generation that has served within its confines.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we replace the Thomas Crawford Statue of Freedom tomorrow to crown the beauty of her magnificent dome, join with me to remember the labor and vision of those who over the centuries created this incredible structure: the Capitol of the United States of America.

□ 1010

#### CALLING FOR A PROHIBITION ON INTERNATIONAL KIDNAPING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to prohibit the United States from apprehending foreign criminal suspects outside of U.S. property without consent of the foreign government that is involved. My concern stems from the kidnapping several years ago of a Mexican citizen, in Mexico, who was wanted by U.S. authorities for allegedly murdering a United States Drug Enforcement Administration agent. The United States kidnaped Mexican doctor Humberto Alvarez Machain and brought him to the United States. He was held more than 2 years in Federal prison while legal protests of the kidnapping were pursued in U.S. courts. Unfortunately, the United States Supreme Court ruled in 1992 that the abduction had not violated a United States-Mexico extradition treaty because the practice was not expressly prohibited by the treaty. Dr. Alvarez was subsequently acquitted and he has now filed a lawsuit against the United States for more than \$20 million in damages.

My concerns about the United States actions in this case are many, but not least among them is my concern over the United States breach of the sovereignty of another country. We did this in Panama, when we invaded and kidnaped their official leader, Gen. Manuel Noriega, bringing him to trial, conviction, and incarceration in the United States, and of course we did this in Dr. Alvarez' case.

Especially when our country is looking toward greater and closer ties with Mexico, and indeed with nations all around the world, we must reaffirm our commitment to obeying the letter as well as the spirit of the law. Clearly, when the United States signed a treaty with Mexico on extradition, that treaty was contemplated to address procedures for seizing and moving suspects across the United States-Mexico border. Can you imagine the outrage in the United States if the Mexican Government captured a United States citizen living in, say, Washington, DC, and transported that person back to Mexico, held him in

prison for several years, and eventually tried him—all against the will of the United States Government? Why, we would scream loud and long, and I have no doubt that we would retaliate. Mexico did not retaliate against us, but you had better believe that the citizens of Mexico, not to mention Mexican Government officials, will never forget what we did. Now, as NAFTA is being contemplated, what assurance does the Mexican Government have that the United States will keep its trade and finance promises?

We had better realize, as well, that other nations carefully watched the unfolding of events both in Panama and in Dr. Alvarez' case. They must know that if we treat our neighbor so cavalierly, we will likely treat others equally, or worse.

In his dissent from the Supreme Court case that upheld the Government's kidnapping of Dr. Alvarez, Justice Stevens pointed out the logical extension of the Court's opinion: "If the United States . . . thought it more expedient to torture or simply to execute a person rather than to attempt extradition, these options would be equally available because they, too, were not explicitly prohibited by the Treaty." Thus, there is a clear need for corrective legislation since the executive branch acted in this unlawful manner and the judicial branch sanctioned it. Congress must now recommit our Nation to being the Nation of laws for which it has always stood. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

#### CONGRESSIONALLY UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a constitutional amendment to prevent the Congress from enacting unfunded Federal mandates. There are three justifications for it that I will outline: First, the Federal Government has encroached beyond the role the Constitution sets for it; second, State governments have no realistic way to combat this unwarranted Federal encroachment; and third, costs of unfunded mandates have interfered with the delivery of essential services by State and local governments. Let me talk briefly about the first two points and then give you some examples that show how this problem is seriously impairing our ability to represent the best interests of American taxpayers and citizens.

It has somehow been all but forgotten that originally the States voluntarily ceded power to form the Federal Government. In the interest of invigorated growth of prosperity, of unified and cooperative defense of borders, and of a common association, the diverse colonies formed a strong nation.

What has grown up out of our Constitution is the most brilliant success in the world's history—a Nation of unequalled prosperity, an unflinching sense of justice, uncompromising com-

passion, and unparalleled strength. It is diversity.

In ceding powers, the States bargained to maintain their diversity from one another, and preserve a substantial degree of autonomy over affairs not within the scope of the national government. In article I, section 8, they gave Congress the power to "lay and collect taxes," to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States," to borrow and coin money, to regulate international and interstate commerce, to establish post offices, to declare war and provide an army and a navy, and to do a small assortment of other things.

These are broad powers, but at the same they are both limited and enumerated. They were never intended to encompass a grant nearly all power. Let me emphasize a degree of diversity and autonomy were to be preserved. As Chief Justice Marshall said:

No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the states, and of compounding the American people into one common mass.

In fact, given the widespread suspicion of accumulated centralized power, State powers were viewed as the broader, because State retained all powers not expressly granted to the Federal Government. States were to have whatever the Federal Government could not have. Among other things, this included the direct power to promote the general welfare, the police power—so to speak—and power over intrastate commerce. The will of the States was to remain to a substantial degree unencumbered by the national will. Yet it has become encumbered today to an alarming extent through enactment of Federal mandates.

The Supreme Court afforded ample room for the enumerated Federal powers to expand and adapt to the Nation's progress. Today the Federal Government can use the Federal commerce power to regulate for health and safety, to control the waters, to protect civil rights, and to fight street crime. All well and good, one might say, but as the realm of the Federal Government has been aggrandized, the States have been left without a clear expression of the limits to Federal power.

Until modern times, there have been limits on the role of the National Government in our federalist system. Congress long sought to avoid areas of traditional State regulation, not daring to run afoul of perceived constitutional limitations. But in the post-New Deal era, most particularly in the post-Great Society era, this self-restraint has failed.

#### GROWTH OF FEDERAL MANDATES

A recent *Insight* magazine article calculates 17 mandates from 1960 to 1985. Then from 1988 to 1992—just 4 years—the Federal Government added 88 mandates relating to toxics alone. Already this year, no less than 130



mandates have been proposed by a Congress full of avowed reformers and would-be reinventors of government.

With this backdrop, the Supreme Court sought some relief for the States in 1976. Combining through the goals and purposes of the Constitution and its expression of the vision of its Framers, the Supreme Court in *National League of Cities versus Usery* found grounds for a defined sanctuary of State powers where Federal power could not intrude. Justice Rehnquist wrote that insofar as Congress's enactments "directly displace the States' freedom to structure integral operations in areas of traditional [state] governmental functions, they are not within the authority granted Congress by article 1, section 8, clause 3." The Court found Congress could not impose Federal minimum wage standards on State employees because to do so "would impair the States' 'ability to function effectively within a federal system'" and destroy the states' "separate and independent existence." Importantly, the court also cited the potential threat to State funding for essential services as one reason why there should be a substantive limit to the Federal commerce power. I will talk more about funding in a few minutes.

The Court junked this ruling in 1985, overruling it in *Garcia versus San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority*. The Court cited considerable difficulties in determining what were "integral" and "traditional" State functions. The Court said that

\*\*\* the principle means chosen by the Framers to ensure the role of the States in the federal system lies in the structure of the Federal Government itself.

That is, the Supreme Court has decided that the States have not defined inviolate sovereign area. Apparently not even setting State budgets would be safe from Congress were it to find a commerce clause reason for overtaking it.

The Court has expressed an unworkable vision of the relationship between Congress and the States. It has left the Federal Government with a virtually unobstructed path to destroy the States' role in a federalist system. The courts will not guard the States from intrusion by Congress, and the States have few defenses of their own to prevent it.

In fact, nothing else exists in the structure of Government to create political pressure against encroachment by the Federal Government. Election of Senators by the State legislators may have been intended as a mechanism for States to check Federal power, but the 17th amendment removed the senatorial elections from State legislatures and gave it to the people. There are checks and balances between the Congress, the executive branch and the judiciary, but no realis-

tic checks upon the Federal Government by the State governments.

It is essential to limit the Federal Government by prohibiting unfunded mandates. Mandates are pushing some governments to the brink of collapse. Mandates allow Federal legislators to avoid the consequences of tough political choices, because in great measure they shift the tough political choices to the States. Congress can enact programs that sound nice, but force State or local politicians to raise taxes or cut services to pay for them. Under our federalist system as envisioned by the Supreme Court and by the Congress itself, there is often little incentive for the Congress to ensure that the programs are cost effective, that they are sensible, or even that they work. Our Constitution certainly never intended this lack of accountability.

Let me expand upon this point about costs to State and local governments, because it is really the catalyst of my legislation, and probably the most persuasive argument for Congress changing the way it does business. When Congress imposes an unfunded mandate on a State government, the State must spend money to implement it. Unfunded mandates force State legislatures to cut services or raise taxes. Often, the services being cut are essential ones, like fire, police, education or medical. Furthermore, should conditions change in the State, legislators have a more difficult time making the case for more cuts or more taxes, even in the name of preserving essential services, when taxpayers have already been forced to sacrifice.

#### COSTS TO STATE OF OHIO

The State of Ohio recently became the first State to conduct a comprehensive review of unfunded mandates and the cost of compliance. The findings are beyond startling—they are staggering. This fiscal year, the State expects to spend over \$300 million for unfunded Federal mandates, an increase of more than 18 percent over the previous year. By 1995, the costs will increase another 26 percent to over \$389 million, just for existing mandates. Add to this the cost of mandates already enacted this year, and you have a mandate avalanche piling up on State governments.

What Congress in effect says is "we know how to spend your money better than you do," and "our priorities have precedence over yours." Both of these statements are routinely proven false. For example, Federal regulations could require cities to keep atrazine levels in drinking water below 3 parts per billion. Yet a human would have to drink 38 bathtubs of water per day with 3 parts per billion atrazine to equal the dose found to be cancerous in rats. It could cost the city of Columbus \$80 million to build a water purification plant to comply with this rule. For the same amount of money required to protect our children from this phantom,

the city could hire an extra 2300 teachers at the average State salary.

Another interesting fact the city of Columbus found: Federal environmental mandates are costing every resident of the city \$856 per year. Think about a family of four getting by on \$35,000 or \$40,000 per year. \$856 is an awful lot of money to ask for on top of taxes, but Congress just keeps asking for more.

While the Federal Government was mandating that Medicaid coverage be extended for a full year to families with too much employment income to continue qualifying for Medicaid, States like Ohio were forced to come up with deep budget cuts to meet balanced budget requirements. Medicaid changes enacted by Congress several years ago cost the State over \$50 million in 1992. This is more than the State spent out of general revenue funds on the entire Department of Health. Since 1992 the State has had to adopt general revenue fund cuts in its line item for uninsured health care, cystic fibrosis, nursing home training, sickle cell disease control, encephalitis control, screenings for infant hearing, and the list continues. In a way, those cuts were mandated by Congress.

I was contacted last month by Chief Ronald Rank of the Van Wert, Ohio Fire Department. He was upset by a Department of Transportation rule requiring them to replace fiberglass air tanks that firemen use when entering smoke-filled areas. Not one of these tanks is worn out, and to their knowledge, there has never been a problem with one of these tanks anywhere in the country. Yet this local fire department will be forced to spend \$9500 to replace them. For this same amount of money, the fire department could train an extra 15 volunteers to help fight fires. That would quadruple the number of volunteers the department can afford now, after budget cuts in each of the last 3 years.

The Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act requires schools to design programs to assess "student progress," a requirement that merely adds to the estimated 170 Federal reports already required every year of local school districts. A good school would already be assessing progress anyway. With the estimated \$15 million Ohio will spend on this paperwork over the next 4 years, the State could reinstate most of its career development program, which had to be zeroed out this year because of budget shortfalls. The State could also increase funding for adult literacy by more than 50 percent. Or the State could hire another 110 vocational education teachers at the average State teacher salary. Even most Members of Congress are not so mixed up to think more paperwork is more beneficial to our children than a good teacher.



Examples like this are what gave me the idea earlier this year for a Mandate-O-Meter, a device by which to judge how onerous a piece of legislation would be to State and local governments.

#### MANDATE-O-METER

I hope to bring this out from time to time to help my colleagues assess the impact of mandate legislation being considered here in the House. This is the mandate-o-meter, and what it does is test each bill for its impact on State and local governments. It looks at the cost to the States, then compares that with what else could have been done with the money, just like I've done with some of the examples I just gave.

The first item I have chosen as a test piece for the mandate-o-meter is the motor voter legislation we passed earlier this year. This is just the kind of benign-sounding, but expensive and unnecessary legislation that makes State budget officers wince in disgust. While Members of Congress passed congratulatory handshakes back and forth, the State of Ohio has started scrambling to figure out how to come up with the estimated \$20 million per year it will cost to implement this bill. That's a lot of money for some new mandated government forms and an expanded role for the omnipresent Federal bureaucracy. Let's see what the mandate-o-meter says.

The \$20 million could have been used in Ohio for an extra 574 teachers. With that money you could increase by nearly 65 percent the number of tutors and small group instructors. You could double the number of preschool special education teachers. Or you could pay 40 percent of the budget for elementary school counselors. The State could have hired more than 400 extra highway patrolmen. That means the State could have increased its number of patrolmen by nearly 25 percent. It could increase tenfold its drug traffic interdiction team. Think about how much difference that could make in the war on drugs. The State could also have offered full 1-year scholarships to nearly 2000 students to attend Ohio State University.

Keep in mind that a State's administrative cost for mandates is often only the tip of the iceberg of the overall cost. Often the State's role is to oversee what local governments are implementing, and the cost of actually implementing mandates can be far more astronomical. For example, while Ohio estimates its costs in 1993 at \$308 million for all unfunded mandates, nine Ohio cities will spend an average of \$280 million per year for the next decade implementing just the environmental mandates.

Note that so far I have avoided mention of Federal requirements that are merely conditions to the receipt of Federal funding. There is a difference, as far as constitutional law is con-

cerned, and as far as my amendment is concerned, between forcing the States to act inefficiently, and merely inducing them to act inefficiently by providing Federal funding. To illustrate the point, let me briefly mention one of these. The 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act included a provision requiring States to use recycled rubber from used tires in pavements. Processing used tires for use in rubber pavements costs up to \$4 per tire, while using tires for fuel would cost \$1 or less. The recycled rubber often costs three times as much as conventional asphalt, increasing the cost of construction and thereby limiting the amount of work which can be done. This may be an inefficient requirement for resources use, but nonetheless, States are free not to participate in the Federal highway program. I do not condone requirements that result in tax dollars being spent inefficiently, yet the Congress must be able to condition the use of Federal funds on the achievement of its legislative purposes.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The constitutional amendment I am introducing would prohibit the Federal Government from enacting requirements forcing the expenditure of State or local funds. It reads:

The Congress shall not enact any provision of law that has the effect of requiring any State or local government to expend non-Federal funds to comply with any Federal law unless the Congress reimburses the State or local government for the non-Federal funds expended to comply with that Federal law.

[This] shall not prohibit the Congress from enacting a provision of law that permits a State or local government to choose to expend non-Federal funds in order to receive Federal funds.

A constitutional amendment is necessary to resolve the problem of unfunded Federal mandates because without a constitutional requirement, Congress can simply continue to pile up expensive programs on the backs of State and local governments. If Congress were to enact a statutory provision, it could be waived any time Congress felt the urge to spend someone else's money instead of the mountains of cash it already squeezes out of Federal taxpayers.

I have cosponsored bills that would make a statutory restriction on congressional authority to pass unfunded mandates. But the Constitution is a more appropriate place for this type of legislation, because what we are talking about here is an alteration to the structure of Government. We are talking about reestablishing the balance our Founding Fathers envisioned when they ratified the Constitution. As I mentioned earlier, the Supreme Court's federalism formula leaves the power of the National Government unchecked.

We want a nation of prosperity, with good medical services for everyone, clean water to drink, healthy food to

eat, streets that are safe to walk at night, a roof over everyone's head, schools that teach our children to be productive members of society, and a strong military to protect us from foreign aggressors. We want a nation without anguish, without injury and disease, without poisons, weapons, drugs and criminals.

We should have these things, but some in Congress have never learned enough about the history of our great country to know that this National Legislature is not the forum for resolving all of these issues. We have the power, and we have the compassion, yet too often we are unwilling to admit that we do not have the focus to provide for the diverse problems arising across this vast Nation.

The Federal Government has long had its foot on the necks of the States, and its hands rummaging through their wallets. For lack of breath the States were long unconscious. But I tell my colleagues that the awakening has come. On October 27, I will join my colleagues in the Congressional Mandates Caucus for another special order here on National Unfunded Mandates Day. Governors, State legislators, mayors and other officials across the country will raise the call. Congress should be listening.

As a final note, I would like to thank the Ohio Governor's office, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Heritage Foundation, and the Congressional Mandates Caucus for their leadership and assistance on this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILLMOR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BATEMAN, for 60 minutes each day, on October 26, 27, 28, and 29.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SANDERS, for 60 minutes, on November 3.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILLMOR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RICHARDSON.  
Mr. STOKES.  
Ms. LAMBERT.  
Mr. POSHARD.  
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey in two instances.  
Mr. OLVER.  
Mr. DELAURO.  
Mr. CONYERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILLMOR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MENENDEZ.  
Mr. NATCHER.  
Mr. CLEMENT.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 26, 1993, at 12 noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2811. A bill to authorize certain atmospheric, weather, and satellite programs and functions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103-248, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEVILL: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 2445. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-305). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 796. A bill to assure freedom of access to clinic entrances; with amendments (Rept. 103-306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. NORTON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. WATT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 3345. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on employee training; to provide temporary authority to agencies relating to voluntary separation incentive payments; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 3346. A bill to give effect to the norms of international law forbidding the abduction

of persons from foreign places in order to try them for criminal offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3347. A bill to reform the laws relating to forfeitures; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. REED, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 3348. A bill authorizing the designation of Portugal, Ireland, and Greece under the visa waiver program under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H.R. 3349. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the first lunar landing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. SPENCE):

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the war powers resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from Somalia by January 31, 1994; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 116: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.  
H.R. 306: Mr. LEVY.  
H.R. 467: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. UNSOELD.  
H.R. 509: Mr. POMBO.  
H.R. 926: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. BATEMAN.  
H.R. 1191: Mr. LANCASTER.  
H.R. 1408: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 2088: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CANADY, Mr. DEAL, and Mrs. FOWLER.  
H.R. 2394: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. RAVENEL.  
H.R. 2395: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 2663: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. DEUTSCH.  
H.R. 2831: Mr. PORTER.  
H.R. 2933: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3030: Mr. MCHUGH.  
H.R. 3080: Mr. FIELDS of Texas and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 3183: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 3321: Mr. TORKILDSEN.  
H.J. Res. 129: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. SWETT.

H.J. Res. 197: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FALEOMAVEAGA, Mr. FIELDS, of Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL of Mas-

sachusetts, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.J. Res. 268: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. KLUG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SHARP, Mr. WATT, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.J. Res. 272: Ms. NORTON, Mr. FISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. SARPALUIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KING, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. FOGLETTA, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.J. Res. 278: Mr. BILLEY, and Mr. KILDEE.  
H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. DEAL.

H. Con. Res. 166: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. GILMAN.

H. Res. 39: Ms. PELOSI, and Mrs. MINK.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 9, October 19, 1993, by Mr. WELDON on House Resolution 227 has been signed by the following Members: Curt Weldon, Dan Burton, Jim Saxton, Dean A. Gallo, J. Dennis Hastert, Joel Hefley, Craig Thomas, Dana Rohrabacher, Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., John L. Mica, Howard Coble, Thomas J. Ridge, Bob Stump, Helen Deilich Bentley, Barbara F. Vucanovich, Cliff Stearns, Bill Emerson, Jim Ramstad, Stephen E. Buyer, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Tillie K. Fowler, Michael Bilirakis, Jim Bunning, Peter G. Torkildsen, James M. Inhofe, Philip M. Crane, Christopher Shays, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., and Robert K. Dornan.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. SOLOMON on H.R. 493: Joe Kollenberg and Howard Coble.

Petition 4 by Mr. HOEKSTRA on House Joint Resolution 9: Howard Coble and Philip M. Crane.

Petition 5 by Mr. STEARNS on House Resolution 156: Christopher Shays, Jim Saxton, Dean A. Gallo, and Philip M. Crane.

Petition 6 by Mr. SENSENBRENNER on H.R. 1025: George J. Hochbrueckner, Constance A. Morella, Peter G. Torkildsen, and Stephen Horn.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**JOBS WELL DONE—NEW COMMUNITY CORPORATION AND BABYLAND NURSERY, INC., CELEBRATE 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE INNER CITY**

**HON. DONALD M. PAYNE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR and I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues an important event that is taking place in my district this weekend. It is the celebration of 25 years of faith and service to a community. In 1967 the central ward of Newark, NJ, devastated by civil unrest, resembled a war-torn battlefield. Much of the area lay in ruins, leaving the residents, mostly poor minorities, desperately in need of housing, employment, and social services. Msgr. William J. Linder, a local pastor, founded New Community Corporation [NCC], a minority-based and nonprofit community development corporation, to replace what the civil disorders had destroyed during the long hot summer. He asked for a 20-year commitment from a coalition of local residents and suburbanites who worked for years in the face of tremendous odds against success.

Nevertheless, New Community has largely achieved its goal to improve the quality of life of the people of Newark to reflect individual dignity and personal achievement. Beginning with a single development of family housing, it has flourished into a major real estate presence and employer in the central ward, owning and managing dozens of buildings and several businesses.

A major contributor to the revitalization of Newark's neighborhoods, New Community is unique because it is totally a grassroots venture. It houses over 6,000 individuals in decent, affordable apartments and homes in 15 housing developments containing 2,498 units in senior high rises, family town houses, and mid-rise mixed tenancy buildings. Stretching for blocks, NCC forms a city within a city.

In addition to housing, NCC provides employment, day care, education, social services, job training, and health care to urban residents under the umbrella of the State's largest community development and nonprofit housing corporation—and one of the largest in the Nation. The ninth largest nongovernment employer of Newark residents in the city, NCC provides jobs for 1,200 people; 96 percent minority and 66 percent Newark residents.

NCC succeeded in changing and improving the lives of thousands of inner-city residents while transforming much of the central ward into an attractive urban neighborhood. Built on the ashes of civil disorders, it is a major factor in maintaining the stability of the area through its housing and business ventures. Its neighborhood shopping center's Pathmark super-

market/pharmacy serves over 50,000 shoppers a week, providing the local populace with a focus that extends beyond procuring food to a social dimension unparalleled in the area. NCC's 25-year history stands as a proud testimony to its service to the urban poor.

In 1969, Babyland Nursery opened in the basement of Scudder Homes, a Newark housing project with the efforts of Operation Housewives, a suburban-urban women's coalition, the Telephone Pioneers of America, a \$1,000 loan, thrift shop volunteers, Girl Scouts, and a suburban pediatrician. It was the first nonprofit, interracial, nonsectarian day care center in New Jersey serving children from ages 2½ months to 5 years.

Six centers now serve 640 children, including HIV-positive toddlers and homeless children. Three programs for teenage mothers currently operate in two Babylands and several local high schools. It also maintains a protective service for abused and neglected children; a Family Day Care Program, a residential shelter for battered women and their children; and the Children Together Home, a residence where neglected or abused siblings under age 12 receive foster care as a family group.

Babyland Nursery, Inc. is the third largest day care operator in the Nation and the largest in New Jersey. It has grown from seven rooms in a housing project to opening its seventh center this fall.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will want to join us in congratulating the New Community Corporation and Babyland Nursery for their successes. Let me add my thanks, on behalf of my constituents, for the vision, commitment, and perservance exhibited.

**IN CELEBRATION OF THE 23D ANNIVERSARY OF PROCEED, INC. OF NEW JERSEY**

**HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Proceed in celebration of its 23d anniversary. The mission of Proceed, a non-profit organization in my home State of New Jersey, is to provide families and individuals with a comprehensive network of appropriate supportive and preventive health and human services that are culturally and linguistically designed to reaffirm self-actualization and improve living standards in our communities.

Proceed provides a full range of programs and services to the Hispanic communities of New Jersey. The Rafael Cordero Day Care Center provides a safe environment for the early education of children between the ages of 2½ and 5, enabling parents to work or continue their education. The bilingual staff helps

children to understand and appreciate both Latino and American cultures while strengthening their educational foundation. The parents association invites parents to participate in the development of the center and provides opportunities to acquire new skills in supporting their children emotionally, physically, and intellectually.

The Roberto Clemente Youth Center provides young people a home away from home after school and during the summer months. The center offers adolescents the opportunity to socialize and learn in a healthy environment as an alternative to the street culture of potential violence and substance abuse. Workshops are offered on a variety of youth-related issues ranging from dealing with peer pressure to maintaining good relations with parents. Arts and crafts, computer literacy, tutoring, music, and theater activities as well as organized athletics and recreation are also offered. Youngsters in the program's Young Life Theatre Group performed an original play on AIDS awareness in 1992.

Families who seek support with child rearing and marital issues are provided with training to sharpen their parenting, conflict resolution and household management skills. Counseling services are offered in the family center as well as at the client's home when possible. It includes both individual and family counseling concerning issues of child abuse and neglect, family violence, behavior management, and overcoming the impact of alcohol and substance abuse.

A special Proceed multi-services and home energy improvement program provides a variety of services to more than 2,000 families and individuals each year who are in need of rental and food assistance, interpretation and translation, home energy and security improvements and other entitlement-related services. This advocacy and referral program was recently honored by the State of New Jersey for its efforts in home energy improvements.

Proceed offers a range of services related to HIV and AIDS which affirm for clients a meaningful life after diagnosis. In addition, the program offers education and prevention programs to the community along with counseling and case management and referral services. All clients are treated with respect and confidentiality.

The substance abuse prevention and counseling unit provides services to persons affected directly or indirectly with the use of alcohol and other drugs. This outpatient, non-medical program is family-oriented and tailored to individual needs and situations.

The new health unit promotes the good health and well-being of Latinos and other underserved individuals in Union County through education and advocacy with particular emphasis on prevention of diseases such as tuberculosis, AIDS, heart disease, and alcoholism.

I want to join with the Latino community in thanking Chairman Carlos J. Alma, Heriberto

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Sanchez-Soto, executive director, and the entire staff of Proceed for their dedication to families and individuals in need. I commend them to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, and look forward to many more years of their service and success.

A SPECIAL SALUTE TO DR. MURRAY GOLDSTEIN, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

**HON. LOUIS STOKES**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the retirement of a very distinguished public servant, Dr. Murray Goldstein, the Director of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, an institute of the National Institutes of Health. As director of the institute, Dr. Goldstein has testified for more than two decades before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, of which I am a member. Always well prepared, Dr. Goldstein embarked upon his intriguing testimony with zeal and responsiveness to the subcommittee's concerns, outlining the Institute's advances, opportunities, challenges, and needs.

Dr. Goldstein, is indeed to be commended for a job well done. In fact, under Dr. Goldstein's leadership, the budget for the Institute has more than doubled, growing from \$265 million in 1982 to a fiscal year 1994 appropriation of approximately \$631 million. More importantly, advances stemming from research supported and conducted by the Institute have improved the quality of life for the American people. Advances have ranged from treatments for spinal cord injury, to prevent measures for stroke, to the identification of the genes responsible for several neurological disorders. Indeed, Dr. Goldstein's influence, insight, and creativity, complimented by his drive for innovation continue to extend beyond the institute.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Goldstein's leadership has exemplified steadfast commitment to furthering advances in the quality of health care, and to improving the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of neurological disorders and stroke. The Nation and the biomedical research communities have benefited well from his outstanding achievements and those he has fostered to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dr. Murray Goldstein on his distinguished career and applaud his overwhelming commitment and continued dedication. I have enjoyed and am proud of my close working relationship with him, and wish him much success as he begins to chart his next course.

TRIBUTE TO CARL PERKINS

**HON. BOB CLEMENT**

OF TENNESSEE

**HON. JOHN S. TANNER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, we stand today to recognize an outstanding Tennessean, and a national cultural treasure, the man in "Blue Suede Shoes," Mr. Carl Perkins, who is to be honored on October 26, 1993, as the first performer recognized by the Jackson, TN, symphony orchestra in their "Legends" concert series.

Many consider Carl Perkins a legend in the entertainment industry because he helped create a uniquely American art form that has had a worldwide impact. However, to those who know him best, he is an enormously talented, yet humble man, who through good times and bad, has always played his music with honesty, feeling, and integrity. Carl credits his success to the support and love from his beautiful wife, Val, and to his children, Debbie, Stan, Greg, and Steve.

Carl Perkins was born into a sharecropping family in Lake County, TN, in the darkest days of the Great Depression. The two certainties of his early life were grinding poverty, and a rich exposure to the music of the South. Black gospel in the rural churches of Lake County, country from the Grand Ole Opry broadcasts every Saturday night, and blues tunes he heard from fellow sharecroppers were his musical influences.

As Perkins and his brothers Jay and Clayton picked up instruments and began to play west Tennessee barn dances and juke joints on Saturday nights, he learned he could fuse the styles of music he had heard into a distinctive new sound. Some called it raunchy and sinful, others simply called it rockabilly or rock 'n' roll.

Perkins was soon drawn to Sun Records in Memphis in 1955 where he and other musical rebels such as Elvis Presley, Johnny Cash, Jerry Lee Lewis, and Roy Orbison were allowed to give full vent to their restless, creative energy; and as a result, they developed and refined the ground rules for the new rock 'n' roll sound.

One of his most distinguished contributions to the early days of rock 'n' roll was to compose one of its most memorable anthems, "Blue Suede Shoes," a song which he wrote down in the early hours of the morning on a torn piece of a potato sack while living in a Jackson, TN, housing project. This song was to sell over 2 million records for Perkins, and become the first recording to ever top both the country and rhythm and blues charts at the same time.

Carl Perkins' influence on the history of rock 'n' roll is immeasurable. He is credited, along with Chuck Berry, as being one of the most influential guitar players of the 1950's rockers. Eric Clapton, the Beatles, Bob Dylan, and many others have all testified to the powerful impact Perkins' vocal and instrumental style has had on their careers.

Today, four decades after its beginning, Carl Perkins' career is still blossoming. His songs

have been performed by the likes of Billy Ray Cyrus, the Judds, and the Kentucky Headhunters just to name a few, and he has recently recorded with Bruce Springsteen, Joan Jett, and Huey Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, we invite you and the rest of our colleagues to rise and honor Mr. Carl Perkins, a musical pioneer and a true gentleman in every sense of the word.

THE ASSET FORFEITURE JUSTICE ACT

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, an investigative series in the Pittsburgh Press caught my attention. It's one thing to read about an occasional incident where a citizen's rights were violated, but this extraordinary series "Presumed Guilty," documented hundreds of cases of innocent victims caught up in a judicial nightmare—people who lost their homes, their businesses, and their livelihoods, but were never found guilty of any criminal conduct.

Similar stories then appeared elsewhere across the country, in the Houston Chronicle, and the Orlando Sentinel.

As a result, the Committee on Government Operations initiated an investigation of the Department of Justice's Asset Forfeiture Program, and held several hearings to examine the complaints of individuals whose property had been seized. We learned that in fact, 80 percent of the people whose property is seized under the Asset Forfeiture Program were never even charged with a crime.

We found a pattern and practice of abuse by State and local law enforcement that is fostered by a Federal program with a built-in financial incentive that cannot help but impact law enforcement priorities. We learned about successful efforts to remove cash from the streets, instead of drugs, when Florida State troopers only stop cars traveling north on Interstate 95.

We found that "drug courier profiles" are not imaginary: this past June the NAACP filed a civil rights suit against the Sheriff's department in Volusia County, FL, alleging that it uses a racially oriented drug courier profile to target African-American and Hispanic motorists traveling along Interstate 95. The lawsuit contends that over 90 percent of the hundreds of motorists who have had their property seized since 1989 are African-American or Hispanic.

While communities like Little Compton, RI, and Lakewood, CO, net millions of dollars as a result of huge drug busts, the money cannot be spent for drug treatment and education programs. Instead, these small towns strain credibility as they strain the definition of law enforcement and pick up the tab for fireworks, video cameras, and body heat detection devices for a police force of six.

In 1984, Congress expanded the asset forfeiture laws to allow the government to take property without charging the owner of any crime. The intent was to strike at the heart of major drug dealers for whom prison time was

the cost of doing business. Every crime bill since has expanded the use of forfeiture.

A law designed to give cops the right to confiscate and keep the luxury possessions of major drug dealers mostly ensnares the modest homes, cars and hard-earned cash of ordinary, law-abiding people. This was not the way it was supposed to work.

The cornerstone of our system of justice is supposed to be a presumption of innocence until one is proven guilty. As far as I know, this is the only part of our criminal justice system that ignores the presumption of innocence. The time has come to change the law.

I introduced H.R. 2774 in the last Congress which would redirect 50 percent of the proceeds in the Asset Forfeiture Program to community-based crime control efforts, drug education and treatment programs. Today, in response to my committee's investigation, I am introducing legislation to provide comprehensive due process and oversight protections for those individuals subject to civil asset forfeiture, and to redistribute the assets that are seized.

#### BASEBALL IN TAMPA BAY

### HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as the World Series continues, to say that no matter which team emerges as champion—the Philadelphia Phillies or Toronto Blue Jays—the ninth district of Florida will step into that winner's circle, as well.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the ninth district of Florida is the springtime home of both of these teams. The Phillies winter in Clearwater, FL, the largest city in my district, and the Blue Jays play citrus league ball just up the road in Dunedin.

The people of Florida's ninth district—or maybe I should say the cradle of champions—are happy to cheer on both of our teams. We delight in sharing them with Philadelphia and Toronto, and we are intensely proud of their minor league affiliates—teams that have produced the great talent currently commanding the Nation's attention in the October classic.

Maybe now, Mr. Speaker, major league baseball will see fit to give the Tampa Bay area the major league baseball time that it has denied us for so long.

Then watch us go.

#### TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL MAGIC WEEK

### HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to National Magic Week.

Before there was a National Magic Week there was a National Magic Day.

It all started with a "Houdini Day" in the summer of 1927, less than 1 year from his

death. A trophy in honor of Houdini was presented by Mrs. Harry Houdini, to the winner of the underwater contest at the Miramar Pool in New York City.

There were many other Houdini Days following, but it was not until 1938 that Les Sholtz, a member of the Society of American Magicians, in Chicago sought official sanction for a Houdini Day.

A friend of the Houdinis requested and obtained permission from Mrs. Houdini to proclaim October 31 as National Magic Day in honor of Harry Houdini. The plan was formulated at that time to have free performances for shut-ins and handicapped people.

Harry Houdini served as the president of the Society of American Magicians for 9 years until his death on October 31, 1936.

Many newspapers carried the story about National Magic Day and various magical societies kept the idea alive.

The first radio broadcast about National Magic Day occurred over radio station KQW on July 20, 1938. Mrs. Harry Houdini participated in that broadcast.

It was not long before National Magic Day became National Magic Week. The Society of American Magicians adopted the idea as a way of promoting the art of magic and at the same time performing shows at orphanages, hospitals and nursing homes for those who would have difficulty getting to a theatre to see a live performance.

The members of the Society of American Magicians that participate in these shows find it a rewarding and worthwhile activity.

Each year Governors, mayors and other governing bodies throughout the country are requested to issue proclamations declaring the last week in October, National Magic Week and encouraging magicians throughout the country to participate in the activities.

Many people enjoy magic shows during this week that otherwise would not be able to do so.

For many years the Society of American Magicians has been encouraging the U.S. Postal Service to issue a stamp honoring the memory of Houdini. He is a person with an international reputation and his name is almost synonymous with magic.

Magic displays can be found at libraries, stores and malls throughout the country during National Magic Week.

When magic week is over each local assembly of the Society of American Magicians is encouraged to compile their magic week activities in a book and submit them to the National Council of the Society of American Magicians where they are judged and awards are given at the National Convention held each year, usually the following July.

National Magic Week is the magical fraternity's way of sharing with others a great art form that is deeply loved by those that participate in it.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, I ask that you rise today to pay tribute to The Society of American Magicians in recognition of National Magic Week October 25–31.

#### NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month during National 4-H Week I recognized several individuals from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky for their achievements in the 4-H program. At this time, I would like to mention a few more people from the district I represent for their outstanding accomplishments through 4-H.

Kathleen Barako of Jefferson County was an adult area champion in the Conrad Feltner Leadership Program and Lauren Fassler was a teen champion.

Extension agents who received radon grants for their areas are: William Spicer of Adair County, Woodford Baumgardner of Jefferson County and Dennis Ruhl of Jefferson County.

State champions for demonstrations are: Seth Sklare of Jefferson County for junior animal science, Ashley Harker of Jefferson County for junior health and Rachel Heaney of Lincoln County for senior computers. Nine-year-old Kristen Edwards of Jefferson County is the State talk meet winner in her division. State champions for project records are: Rachel Deal of Jefferson County for forestry and Thor Steffen of Jefferson County for wood science.

The following young people were named either first in their class, reserve champion or grand champion at Kentucky's State fair this year: Lincoln County—Debbie Playforth, Brooke Todd, Street Spoonmoore, Chase Gander, Stacy Allen, Eric Woolridge, Alan Hubble, Josh Brown, Bret Curless, Greg Camensch, Larry Chafee, Stacy Allen, Caty Curtis, Joey Reynolds and Doty McQuerry; Jefferson County—Elizabeth Steffen, Karen Barako, Kristen Edwards, Christy Deutsch, Brianna Heitman, Melissa Likens, Anna Boeckman, Megan Morris, Sarra Motamedi, Stacy Carter, Meaghan Dull, Rebecca Ballou, Leighann Wilson, Creighton Klapheke, Jason Warren, Becky Carey, Allen Weber, Kim Childress, Christina Patterson, Katie Otto and Tiffany Patterson.

All of these people have done well and I am proud to represent them in Congress. I wish them continued success in 4-H and in all their future endeavors.

#### THANKS TO MARY TAYLOR

### HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my thanks to Mary Taylor, a resident of Benton, IL, who is retiring after more than 32 years as a caseworker in the General Assistance Office for Benton Township.

During her long and distinguished career, Mary has offered a helping hand to thousands of people who've come to her when times are tough or when the breaks just seem to be going against them. I've heard any number of people remark as to her compassion and concern for the people she helps and the determination she brings to finding a solution to



their problems. My colleagues in the House, we all hear and read about how government doesn't do this or that, but Mary Taylor's story defines for all of us the true meaning of the phrase "public service."

Mary Taylor is still working to improve her community, devoting her time to volunteer work for the Township, helping students with learning disabilities and pitching in on a whole host of other civic minded projects. Mary loves to work—because she loves the people who realize the benefit of her good deeds.

I am honored to call Mary a friend. I thank her for all her good work in the past, and feel confident that we will see her hard at work making her community a better place to live for many years to come.

#### ARCHER COLE—AN UNSUNG HERO

#### HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this weekend one of New Jersey's wisest men is being honored for his 50 years of service to the labor movement. This saga is Archer Cole.

Since 1940, Archer has served in many capacities from shop steward to international director of organization for the IUE-AFL-CIO, a position he now holds. He is also the president of the New Jersey Industrial Union Council, AFL-CIO. He has served as an international representative, as secretary and also president of District 3, IUE, covering New Jersey and New York.

Archer has taught labor studies, lectured extensively, and authored the Anti-Recession Act which was introduced in the House in 1976. New Jersey's former Gov. Brendan Byrne appointed him to the New Jersey Economic Recovery Commission in 1977. He was chairman of the NJ Employment Security Council. In 1984, former Governor Kean named him to the blue ribbon Commission on Unemployment Compensation which resulted in important reforms of the system.

Believing in the development of human resources, Archer has been one of those consistent teachers. No matter what the topic or issue you can always count on Archer to provide sound advice and guidance. He never hesitates when it's time to roll up the old sleeves to get down to business.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will want to join me in congratulating Archer Cole on his 50th anniversary in the labor movement. I want to personally thank Archer for his commitment to mankind and a better world, and to convey the appreciation of all of those he's influenced, especially me and my brother, William.

#### TRIBUTE TO DANIEL HUMBERTO JARA, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE U.S. HISPANIC CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

#### HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Daniel Humberto Jara. Mr. Jara has excelled as both a community and business leader in New Jersey and in the Hispanic community of the United States. Recently Mr. Jara was elected vice chairman of the board of the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

I congratulate Mr. Jara on this significant achievement, Mr. Jara's record for community service and his achievements in business community and with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce merit this great honor.

The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce represents the economic interest of 650,000 Hispanic firms in the United States and Puerto Rico. Mr. Jara's leadership in the chamber has been reflected in increased economic growth and development in New Jersey.

Mr. Jara was born in Lima, Peru, and moved to New Jersey at the age of 14. He graduated from Eastside High School and received his bachelor's and master's degrees from Rutgers University where he is an honorary member of the Rutgers Leadership Recognition Society. Mr. Jara is the founding president of the Statewide Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey, owner of the Rimac Agency, a travel and insurance consulting firm and president of Paterson Motor & Export Co.

Mr. Jara has an excellent record for community service. He has served on many committees and boards, including the Passaic County Cultural Heritage Council, New Jersey Easter Seal Society, and United Way of Passaic County. He is listed in "Who is Who in the Hispanic Community" at the national level and has received commendations for his efforts to assist victims of Hurricane Hugo in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the achievements of Daniel Humberto Jara. I am sure my colleagues join me in paying tribute to Mr. Jara. We hope that his dedication to the Hispanic community will serve as an example for others to follow and wish him continued success as he undertakes his new position as the vice chair of the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

#### HEALTH CARE DELIVERY

#### HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation focuses on health care reform, it is important to recognize programs, organizations, and people who are working to obtain our national goals: lowering costs of health care and broadening coverage so that all Americans

can take advantage of the highest quality health care in the world. Through the leadership and initiative of residents of the Third Congressional District of Connecticut, south central Connecticut has many models of health care delivery worthy of recognition. Today, I want to honor one such program—a partnership that has been established between the West Haven Emergency Assistance Task Force [WHEAT] and Silver's Drug Shop of West Haven.

Eighteen years ago, West Haven clergy founded WHEAT to provide emergency food, clothing, rental assistance and referral services to residents. Over the years the need for these services increased due to the severe downturn of Connecticut's economy. In 1992, 1,200 families requested assistance from WHEAT. Last year, out of concern for the health of WHEAT clients and their families, Director Therese Eke conducted a health care survey. The result: Thirty percent of the West Haven residents assisted by WHEAT do not have any health care coverage.

We are discovering startling statistics like this across the country, statistics that continue to rise. But we are also discovering people like Therese Eke and Scott Silver who refuse to allow lack of health care coverage to prevent West Haven families from receiving the health care services that they need. Last winter Therese reached an agreement with St. Raphael's Hospital of New Haven to use their mobile health clinic. On the first day of service in mid-February 32 families stood waiting in line at WHEAT for their first treatment.

It didn't take long for word of the clinic to spread throughout West Haven. But as the clinic began to distribute prescription's a new problem arose: Families could not afford the price of the medicine being prescribed. Once again, their access to health care was cut off.

Just a couple of blocks away from the WHEAT office is Silver's Drug Shop, a small family-run business. As soon as pharmacist Scott Silver heard of the mobile health clinic and the problem of prescription costs, he contacted Therese to volunteer his services. Within an afternoon the problem was solved. A comprehensive list of 150 antibiotics was created for use by the clinic physician, and anyone with a prescription from the clinic could walk to Silver's Drug Shop and have it filled for \$3 or less.

The residents of West Haven are solving the modern problem of spiraling health care costs with old fashioned community support. One afternoon a week in West Haven, anywhere from 14 to 20 families are at the WHEAT office for physicals, blood pressure tests, shots, prenatal care, and a variety of other primary care services. West Haven school nurses know they can refer families with sick children to the clinic for the care they need. While 75 percent of the families utilizing the clinic do not have health insurance, many who do have health insurance also come to the Friday WHEAT clinic because they simply can not afford their current deductible.

The partnership between the WHEAT Friday afternoon clinic and Silver's Drug Shop is taking south central Connecticut one step closer to our national health care objective by providing affordable, accessible, and confidential health care. Providing preventive care while



maintaining low overhead, the WHEAT clinic is working hard to provide quality care to all our citizens. I applaud WHEAT and Silver's Drug Shop for presenting the families of West Haven with an alternative to the high cost of health care and the opportunity to lead longer, healthier lives.

## **FREEDING THE U.S. COMPUTER INDUSTRY**

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, no challenge or opportunity facing the American Government is more important than adjusting to the post-cold war era. For more than 40 years, a very significant part of our resources went to meeting the threat that the Soviet Union posed, and dealing with this threat distorted our economy in other ways. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, we have the ability to redirect our resources in ways that will greatly benefit us and others. One area where such redirection holds great promise is in the controls we have placed over exports that might have been used in ways deleterious to our security.

I believe that we were imposing these in an excessive fashion for many years, but the argument for this sort of restriction has substantially lessened by any measure recently, and it is now clear that we stand only to benefit by unshackling American businesses and allowing them to compete far more freely in the sale of that high technology where American leadership continues to be impressive.

Robert Palmer, chief executive officer of the Digital Equipment Corp., recently presented this argument in a forceful and thoughtful manner. Mr. Palmer correctly notes that it was the "extraordinary, direct personal involvement of President Clinton" that led to this breakthrough, and I share Mr. Palmer's view that it is important that we follow through in this direction.

Because there are some who still object to the efforts to free American business to compete on equal terms in the world, and because more needs to be done to implement these policies I ask that Robert Palmer's thoughtful article on "Freeing the U.S. Computer Industry" be printed here.

The article follows:

### **FREEDING THE U.S. COMPUTER INDUSTRY**

(By Robert B. Palmer)

For as long as our nation has had commerce and regulation, the actions and inactions of the U.S. government have roused the attention, and often the frustration, of the business community.

For America's computer industry, no public policy issue has been as tedious in its complexity, as frustrating in its persistent unfairness and illogic or as daunting in its bureaucratic strictures as the arcane science of export controls.

During the Cold War, exports of computers to certain countries—principally the Soviet bloc and China—were restricted in the interest of national security under the assumption that technology with both commercial

and military applications might be used to neutralize America's defense advantages. Through the 17-nation Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls, the countries that controlled the world's computer technology were able to enforce common rules.

Events in recent years have greatly altered the picture. The collapse of the Soviet bloc turned old enemies into economic partners. Computer Technology spread around the globe to the point where customers in restricted countries could simply shop elsewhere rather than relying on suppliers from the United States and its allies. And the importance of exports to the U.S. economy became more pronounced.

In Washington, export restrictions failed to keep up with these new realities. Presidents and their cabinets shied away from the issue, Congress neglected it, and the press became involved only when it perceived outright conflict. All the while, outdated export controls helped ship away the international competitiveness of our nation's most accomplished technology companies.

That has all changed. President Clinton, in the most remarkable instance I can recall of the White House working with industry, recently announced dramatic relaxations of the export controls on computers.

With his announcement, the president affirmed something Digital Equipment Corp. and others in the computer industry have been saying for a long time: Increased exports by U.S. companies means jobs and economic security for the nation. Our national security in the future will be guaranteed only by striking the proper balance between the economic success of U.S. business and a well-prepared and well-armed military.

This remarkable change could not have occurred without the extraordinary, direct personal involvement of President Clinton. We have not seen this kind of leadership on issues of great importance to our industry from previous administrations.

In the past, export controls were shrouded in the mystique of national security, which consisted only of military concerns. Even minor progress was greeted by warnings that the export of commonly available general-purpose desktop PCs and work stations to certain countries—countries that can typically buy those machines from numerous sources other than U.S. companies—would somehow destabilize our advantage as a military superpower.

For Digital, the problem posed by outdated export controls was nearing a crisis stage. We conduct business in more than 100 countries and rely on the international market for more than 60 percent of our revenues. Our newest and most advanced products are based on Alpha AXP, Digital's 64-bit microprocessor, which happens to be the world's fastest.

Digital's dilemma: Computers based on Alpha AXP platforms run so fast that today's export regulations would classify even our desktop PCs and low-end work stations as supercomputers and subject them to stringent restrictions even for sale to friendly countries like Switzerland and Ireland. We were being penalized for too much innovation.

The proposed new rules will dramatically cut red tape, delays and uncertainty resulting from unnecessary export license applications for more than \$400 million worth of Digital exports. Of greater importance, the change will free us to compete on even terms with foreign competitors in some of the world's fastest-growing markets with our Alpha AXP desktop computers.

These markets are measured in the billion of dollars, and their importance to U.S. computer companies cannot be overestimated.

Strict controls on the export of computers do not protect national security, they only prevent economic growth. The government's Office of Technology Assessment, following an 18-month study, recently concluded that high-performance computers are not required to design nuclear weapons, and placing strict limits on their exports would be of minimal importance from a military perspective.

Computers are the necessary building blocks for all commercial activity around the world. Sales lost by U.S. companies because of export controls rarely prevent the customer in question from obtaining the desired products. Foreign competitors not subject to such controls gladly step in and make the sale.

If U.S. companies lose the global battle for these markets, then we will have suffered permanent damage to our national security.

Simply reforming export controls will not guarantee that U.S. companies will win those battles. But if the changes proposed by Clinton are successfully implemented through multinational negotiations, our own government will no longer be preventing its most advanced industries from competing on an equal footing and on the merits of our innovations. Those of us in the business community cannot ask for more than that from our government.

## **NATIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH DAY**

**HON. BILL RICHARDSON**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take a moment to recognize the achievements of biomedical research. Yesterday was National Biomedical Research Day. This is a fitting tribute to the thousands of medical researchers, like those at the University of New Mexico, who are working to understand why human disease and illness begin—and how it can be cured. Investment in biomedical research has spawned the biotechnology industry, creating tens of thousands of jobs and offering hope for millions of Americans suffering from cystic fibrosis, AIDS, Alzheimer's disease, heart disease, cancer, and a host of other illnesses and disease.

As Congress and the administration begin to debate in earnest health care reform, National Biomedical Research Day calls attention to one of the most vital, but often overlooked components of our health care equation: investment in biomedical research. Increased support for basic biomedical research will lead to a more profound understanding of the diseases that afflict humans. This in turn will lead to new and improved diagnostic techniques and preventive care.

Biomedical research deserves undiminished Federal support from Congress. I am pleased that from Congress has adequately funded the two agencies responsible for funding much of the biomedical research conducted at leading

U.S. universities and laboratories, the National Institutes of Health and the National Science

Foundation. The current advances and promise of biomedical research is so great that in-

creases in Federal funding must not only be maintained, but increased.